UC-NRLF
$B 31 639

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
Class 904
L421

CHAPTERS

ON

ALLITERATIVE VERSE

BY

JOHN LAWRENCE, D. Lit., M.A. (Lond.)

LEKTOR OF ENGLISH IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A DISSERTATION

IN CANDIDATURE FOR THE DEGREE OF D.LIT. (LOND.)

ACCEPTED BY THE EXAMINERS DEC. 1892

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE

AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1893

Price Three Shillings and Sixpence net

CHAPTERS

ON

ALLITERATIVE VERSE

BY

JOHN LAWRENCE, D. Lit., M.A. (Lond.)

LEKTOR OF ENGLISH IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE

A DISSERTATION

IN CANDIDATURE FOR THE DEGREE OF D.LIT. (LOND.)

ACCEPTED BY THE EXAMINERS DEC. 1892

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE

AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1893

GENERAL
Rich

Oxford
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE.

THE dissertation herewith submitted for approval varies very much from my original design, which was to have written a critical review of recent German treatises on the subject of alliterative verse.

In January last, whilst engaged upon this task, my attention was drawn to certain unusual metrical points which I had noted in Cod. Junius XI in the summer of 1889, thinking them at the time simple errors on the part of the scribe, but which I now saw to be an invaluable clue to the construction of the half-verse. Following this out, by the aid of Prof. Möller's work on alliterative poetry (*Zur ahd. Alliterationspoesie*), I was soon led to the conclusion, stated in Chap. I. p. 30, that the half-verse is constructed on the same plan as the whole verse, that as the latter is divided into two sections by a cæsura, each of which may begin either with an accented, or an unaccented syllable, so is the former. Unfortunately, my notes were confined to the *Exodus* and *Daniel* poems, and it was impossible for me, as I was then stationed at Prague, to consult the MS. further. This circumstance, and the knowledge that during the present year we might expect another article on *Metrik* from Prof. Sievers (to be published in Paul's *Grundriss*) led me to abandon my plan of dealing with the whole subject of alliterative verse-structure, and eventually I decided, until I should return to England,

137778

to confine my attention to the laws of alliteration simply, using as my chief guide the admirable treatise by Rieger: *Die Alt- und Angelsächsische Verskunst.*

Here again, however, I found it impossible to pursue a straight course. The question of crossed alliteration first encountered me. Like other people I had accepted Frucht's calculation as probably decisive. It turned out to be based on false premises. I had therefore to undertake an investigation of my own, and this cost me more weeks of labour than I quite care to confess. When it was at length concluded a fresh subject for research presented itself in the shape of vowel alliteration. I began this with no thought of examining more than *Piers Plowman*, with a view to finding in what respect, if any, its vowel alliteration differed from that of *Béowulf*. I was led on to examine a number of other alliterative poems of the fourteenth century. For myself the work has been very instructive. I can only hope that it will turn out of some use to others also. The tables which I have drawn up will, at any rate, provide a key to the construction of the verses in these poems where it is most difficult to determine. This digression employed me, with two short intervals, until the end of August.

Meanwhile, in July, I had returned to England and made the collation which is given in Chap. I. I found the *Genesis* even richer in exceptional pointing than I had expected, and am sorry that the discussion of vowel alliteration has left me so little time for working up my materials.

The instances in which ordinary points have been omitted in the MS. have had to be left unconsidered.

It is possible that many of these are not due simply to neglect and would, if examined, yield fresh light upon the scribe's theory of O.E. verse. The results given in Chap. I are however sufficient to show what this was in the main. Among the conflicting theories which now hold the field it

agrees most with Prof. Möller's, the simplest and most easily applied of all.

The true rhythm of the Old English verse is not a matter of mere antiquarian interest. Until it is understood the development of English prose-rhythm cannot be properly explained. Probably we shall have to wait some time yet before anything like unity of opinion can exist upon the subject. We have yet to hear what answer Prof. Sievers can make to his various critics, and to receive a more extended treatment from his pen than that contained in *P.B.B.* x, xii, and xiii. My own conviction, however, is that truth lies on the side of Prof. Möller, to whom our Junius scribe now comes as an ally. I would fain hope that my own attempt 'to copy fair what time hath blurr'd' may give some fresh stimulus to the already awakening interest in O.E. verse-lore, and in particular may call increased attention to Prof. Möller's treatise, which even in Germany has been too much neglected.

JOHN LAWRENCE.

6, Rillbank Terrace, Edinburgh,
September 21, 1892.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above was written several months have elapsed, during which I have kept the type of these 'chapters' standing in the hope of giving them a thorough revision before publication.

Circumstances have hitherto conspired to hinder this being done, and I am unwilling longer to delay sending them forth. The chapter on Crossed Alliteration has received some changes, and a few foot-notes (indicated by an asterisk) have been added here and there.

In the interval the 'more extended treatment' by Prof. Sievers has appeared in the shape of his *Altgermanische Metrik* (Halle, November 1892) but without, as far as I can see, much affecting the position of the rival theories.

My own discussion of Prof. Sievers's system begins, rather abruptly, on p. 27 below.

Tarn House, Ilkley,
April 8, 1893.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAP. I.—Metrical Pointing in Codex Junius XI : its relation to theories of O. E. Verse-Structure : collation with Thorpe 1

CHAP. II.—Crossed Alliteration 38

CHAP. III.—Vowel Alliteration in the Fourteenth Century compared with that of Béowulf 56

Vowel Alliteration in Béowulf 60

,, ,, Morte Arthure . . . 65

,, ,, Destruction of Troy . . 77

,, ,, William of Palerne . . 82

,, ,, Alexander 89

,, ,, Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight 91

,, ,, Cleanness 93

,, ,, Patience 94

,, ,, Piers Plowman . . . 101

Concluding Remarks 111

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

THE METRICAL POINTING IN CODEX JUNIUS XI.

'*In der in metrischer Beziehung besonders schlechten Hs. Junius XI*' (*P. B. B.* x. 458). In this way does Prof. Sievers characterize the manuscript containing the poems once attributed to Cædmon. The words sound like a reflection upon the scribe, but can scarcely have been so meant, for never was a slur less merited.

Junius XI alone of O. E. MSS., as far as I am aware, gives us any material help in determining how to read alliterative verse. In the *Béowulf*, as Guest observes (p. 312), and as anyone may see from the E. E. T. S. photographic copy, or from Holder's *Abdruck*, 'the point was used merely to close a period, and the versification had nothing but the rhythm to indicate it.' This appears to be the case with the Exeter Book also, if I may judge from a short examination (which is all I have been able to make) of the transcript of that MS. in the British Museum (Additional MSS. 9067, 154 f.). How it stands with the Vercelli MS. I am unable to say.

The scribe of Junius XI has, however, been at pains to insert the metrical points in most cases. Where mid-points are omitted it is generally after a short first half-verse with single alliteration followed by a second half-verse without *Auftàkt*[1]; e. g.

Þâ sceáwode scyppend ûre (*Gen.* 206).

End-points have seldom been forgotten; less than forty times in the more than 4000 verses of the Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel poems. The points are, with very few excep-

[1] I use this term throughout in preference to the ponderous term *anacrusis* and to Mr. Skeat's *catch* (*Essay on All. Poetry*).

tions, correctly placed, much more so than in Thorpe's edition. Guest (p. 313) tells us that, having marked twenty or thirty cases of 'doubtful prosody in the latter, he afterwards found on examination that in every instance but two the text had been altered.' Our own examination will, I think, confirm the 'doubtful prosody' of Thorpe's verse divisions in most cases where he has deviated from the MS.

The metrical imperfections of Junius XI must therefore lie at the door of the authors themselves who wrote the poems it contains, or possibly of some intermediate scribe, and not of our scribe, who has indeed struggled manfully with the difficulties of the verse, which here and there are considerable. In my short article on the text, in *Anglia* xi. I myself made, it must be confessed, some slight imputation upon his carefulness. This called forth from Prof. Stoddard, of New York University (whose article on the MS. in *Anglia* x. will be remembered), some expressions which he will, I trust, forgive me for inserting here. 'That scribe,' he wrote, 'established with me a very good reputation. I am rather jealous of his honour.' Let me hope Prof. Stoddard will feel that in the present chapter I have made the *amende honorable* for anything said earlier to the disadvantage of one whom we have so much cause to thank as the writer of the Cædmon MS.

In the following table, I give, on the left the instances in which Thorpe has placed a point after words which have none in the MS., and on the right, those in which points have been omitted. The two columns together exhaust the disagreements between Thorpe's edition and Junius XI, as regards the metrical pointing. Verbally, Thorpe's edition is extremely correct, though not absolutely so. The numbers of the verses concerned are given from Grein. The index *a* stands for first half-verse; *b* for second half-verse, as usual.

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.		Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.	
Genesis	Page Line		*Genesis*	Page Line	
1[a]	1, 1	micel			
4[a]	1, 7	ealra			
			9[a]	1, 17	soðfæst.
30[a]	3, 3	onȝan	30[a]	3, 3	unræd.
36[b]	–, 16	werloȝan			
47[b]	4, 2	mode			
48[a]	–, 3	woldan			
50[a]	–, 7	ciningȝ			
53[a]	–, 13	mæra			
			53[b]	4, 13	mod.
			71[b]	5, 15	syððan.
72[a]	5, 15	seomodon			
72[b]	–, 16	siðe	72[b]	–, 16	swearte.
			73[a]	–, 17	þorfton.
79[a]	–, 29	þeawas			
82[b]	6, 2	buan			
			133[a]	8, 32	æresta.
133[b]	8, 32	ȝeseah			
135[a]	9, 1	ȝewat			
141[a]	–, 13	ȝesundrode			
145[a]	–, 21	-flode			
155[b]	10, 12	ȝyt			
			156[a]	10, 13	lond.
165[b]	–, 32	cyninȝ			
170[a]	11, 4	lenȝ			
171[a]	–, 6	wonȝes			
197[a]	13, 3	-ȝrene			
206[a]	–, 21	sceawode			
227[a]	15, 2	selestan			
262[a]	17, 19	onȝan	262[a]	17, 19	enȝyl.
			284[b]	19, 1	striðe.
			285[b]	–, 3	me.
290[a]	19, 12	oleccan			
			291[b]	–, 15	lenȝ.
297[b]	–, 27	ȝehwilc			
298[a]	–, 28	waldend			
317[a]	20, 30	ȝeswinc			
319[a]	21, 4	siðe			
345[b]	22, 24	sweartan	345[b]	22, 25	helle.
			356[a]	23, 10	stȳde.
			395[a]	25, 17	ȝemearcod.
			398[a]	–, 23	adame.
			401[a]	26, 3	nu[1].

[1] This word is omitted in Grein v. 401.

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Genesis	Page	Line		*Genesis*	Page	Line	
				403ª	26,	7	ȝodes.
				403ᵇ	–,	8	nu.
				405ª	–,	11	onwendon.
				408ª	–,	17	bearn.
				425ᵇ	27,	30	mode.
474ᵇ	30,	29	habban	474ᵇ	30,	29	worulde.
475ª	–,	30	witode	475ª	–,	30	wæron.
				475ᵇ	–,	31	ȝeþinȝþo.
486ᵇ	31,	16	he				
487ᵇ	–,	19	fyre	487ᵇ	31,	19	sweartost.
				507ª	32,	22	drihten.
				507ᵇ	–,	23	hine.
511ᵇ	32,	31	witeð				
548ª	35,	1	eorðrice				
555ᵇ	–,	15	he	555ᵇ	35,	15	swa.
				588ᵇ	–,	22	inc.
560ª	–,	25	willende				
561ª	–,	27	rume				
				567ª	36,	5	þines.
567ᵇ	36,	5	habban				
568ª	–,	7	adame				
573ª	–,	17	andwyrde				
583ª	37,	1	ȝeare				
593ᵇ	–,	22	beames				
606ᵇ	38,	14	sceaðða	606ᵇ	38,	15	ȝeorne.
618ª	39,	1	cræfta	618ª	39,	1	cime.
				618ᵇ	–,	2	ȝiet.
640ª	40,	16	morð				
643ᵇ	–,	23	wæstm	643ᵇ	40,	24	an.
				649ᵇ	–,	35	onȝan.
651ª	41,	3	ȝode	651ª	41,	3	bysene.
659ᵇ	–,	20	unc	659ᵇ	–,	21	betere.
683ª	42,	35	ȝeȝnunȝa				
694ᵇ	43,	22	sceaðða				
				702ᵇ	44.	3	ȝodes.
				706ᵇ	–,	9	ȝehate.
711ª	44,	18	bodan				
712ª	–,	20	hyldo				
713ᵇ	–,	23	were	713ᵇ	–,	24	swelce.
				730ᵇ	45,	22	cwyde.
748ª	46,	22	his	748ª	46.	23	eft.
				755ᵇ	47.	4	morðres.
				759ª	–,	11	heortan.

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.		Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.	
Genesis	Page	Line	*Genesis*	Page	Line
			759[b]	47,	12 uncre.
			760[b]	–,	14 eft.
			763[b]	–,	20 liȝas.
764[a]	47,	20 secan			
787[b]	49,	5 ȝodes			
810[a]	50,	17 heofnum			
824[b]	51,	10 adam			
827[a]	–,	15 adam			
828[a]	–,	17 waldendes			
836[b]	–,	34 þeodnes	836[b]	52,	1 hafa.
			839[b]	–,	7 innan.
851[a]	52,	29 leohte			
852[a]	–,	31 feran			
855[a]	53,	2 neosian			
863[a]	–,	18 ahsian			
867[a]	–,	26 her			
872[a]	54,	4 ȝod			
882[a]	–,	24 adam	882[a]	54,	25 eft.
			893[b]	55,	13 sealdest.
			906[b]	56,	3 þinum.
907[a]	56,	3 breostum			
913[b]	–,	17 fiersna	913[b]	–,	18 sætan.
914[a]	–,	18 tohtan			
			914[b]	–,	20 ȝemænc.
918[a]	–,	26 ȝod			
927[a]	57,	12 oƀerne			
			955[a]	58,	32 frofre.
955[b]	58,	32 let			
965[a]	59,	17 þa			
968[a]	–,	23 twa			
			969[a]	59,	25 cain.
972[a]	–,	31 eorƀan			
1000[b]	61,	21 wearð			
1003[a]	–,	26 abel			
1005[a]	–,	30 þon			
			1023[a]	62,	31 æniȝre.
1023[b]	62,	31 are	1023[b]	–,	32 wenan.
1027[a]	63,	4 wenum			
1028[a]	–,	6 ȝemitte			
1036[a]	–,	22 -cwæð			
1052[a]	64,	18 -landum			
			1077[a]	65,	36 ada.
1079[b]	66,	5 ærest			

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.		Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.	
Genesis	Page	Line	*Genesis*	Page	Line
1088[b]	66,	23 isernes			
1090[a]	–,	26 twæm			
1095[a]	67,	3 caines			
1100[a]	–,	13 cyninȝes			
1104[a]	–,	21 adame			
			1107[b]	67,	28 his.
1127[a]	68,	33 ȝedal			
1130[b]	69,	4 hæfde			
1138[b]	–,	20 strynde			
1140[a]	–,	23 hund			
1151[a]	70,	10 fiftyno			
1155[b]	71,	18 wæs			
1217[b]	74,	5 siððan			
1219[a]	–,	8 lichoman			
1219[b]	–,	9 þisse			
1249[a]	75,	32 caines			
1255[a]	76,	10 freo	1255[a]	76,	10 ferhðe.
1270[a]	77,	4 selfa			
1272[a]	–,	8 wæron			
1315[b]	79,	23 heofoncininȝe			
1316[a]	–,	24 ofostlice	1316[a]	79,	24 onȝan.
1337[a]	80,	31 mete			
1338[a]	–,	33 oðera			
1365[b]	82,	21 seȝnade			
1385[a]	83,	25 wræcon			
1390[a]	–,	35 seȝnade			
			1400[a]	84,	19 niehstan.
1401[a]	84,	21 ahafen	1401[a]	84,	21 wæs.
1405[b]	–,	30 ed monne			
1430[a]	86,	13 yða			
1436[a]	–,	25 fandode			
1445[a]	87,	7 wæter			
1446[a]	–,	9 eft	1446[a]	87,	9 wæȝ þele.
1461[a]	88,	6 æfenne			
1485[a]	89,	23 eðelsto	1476[b]	89,	6 eadeȝa.
1504[b]	90,	33 noe			
1521[a]	91,	32 selfa			
1521[b]	–,	33 beȝrindeð	1521[b]	91,	32 ærest.
1522[a]	92,	1 duȝeðum			
1528[b]	–,	14 ȝodes			
			1546[b]	93,	18 þercoba.
			1547[a]	–,	19 olliva.

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Genesis	Page	Line		*Genesis*	Page	Line	
				1551[b]	93,	25	sem.
1553[a]	93,	28	ȝeludon				
1557[a]	94,	5	him				
1572[a]	95,	1	self				
1577[a]	–,	11	ærest				
				1577[b]	95,	12	cam.
1585[a]	–,	27	andwlitan				
				1593[b]	96,	12	selfes.
1601[a]	96,	27	flode	1601[a]	–,	28	eac.
1603[a]	–,	31	stryndon				
				1617[a]	97,	23	chus.
				1654[a]	99,	30	æƀelinȝa.
				1692[b]	101,	35	earm.—
1697[a]	102,	8	þa				
				1697[b]	102,	9	feower.
				1712[a]	103,	2	wearƀ.
				1723[b]	–,	25	secȝeaƀ.
				1726[b]	–,	31	hwæƀre.
1739[a]	104,	22	abrahames				
1758[b]	105,	25	wurƀiaƀ				
				1759[a]	105,	26	þe.
1768[a]	106,	8	ęȝipta [1]				
1805[a]	108,	12	þa				
				1818[b]	109,	6	drohtaƀ.
				1825[b]	–,	20	wlance.
1826[a]	109,	21	æƀelinȝa				
1832[b]	110,	3	min	1832[b]	110,	3	sweostor.
1854[a]	111,	11	sarran				
				1856[b]	111,	16	wif.
1857[a]	–,	16	to				
1873[a]	112,	19	abraham				
1895[a]	113,	30	þy				
1895[b]	–,	31	secan				
1901[a]	114,	8	ȝebyrdum				
1912[b]	–,	31	wanȝas				
1956[b]	117,	20	a	1956[b]	117,	20	æfter.
1960[a]	118,	4	ȝefræȝn				
1964[b]	–,	13	þa	1964[b]	118,	13	feower.
1967[a]	–,	18	herȝum				
				1972[b]	118,	29	bennum.
1973[b]	119,	2	ȝuƀþræce				
1974[a]	–,	3	foran	1974[a]	119,	3	fife.

[1] Grein 1768, *Assyria.*

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Genesis	Page	Line		*Genesis*	Page	Line	
				2016[a]	121,	27	loth.
				2027[a]	122,	15	aner.
				2027[b]	–,	16	escol.
2037[b]	122,	36	him	2037[b]	–,	36	torn.
				2047[b]	123,	19	huru.
				2091[b]	126,	7	lenior.
2092[a]	126,	7	mæȝeð				
2096[a]	–,	16	þanon				
2101[a]	–,	26	solomia				
2135[a]	128,	31	sceoldon				
				2142[b]	129,	12	feoh.
2146[a]	129,	19	wurde				
				2149[a]	–,	24	heonon.
2172[a]	131,	6	þa				
				2173[a]	131,	8	dædrof.
				2182[b]	–,	27	myntеð.
				2183[a]	–,	28	sie.
2207[a]	133,	7	eȝypta				
2219[a]	134,	3	forwyrnde				
2220[a]	–,	5	mæȝburȝe				
2223[a]	–,	11	eðylstæf				
2228[a]	–,	21	recene				
2229[a]	–,	23	afanda				
2229[b]	–,	24	wille	2229[b]	134,	24	frea
2241[a]	135,	11	sarran				
2247[a]	–,	23	ðe				
				2247[a]	135,	23	aȝar.
				2249[a]	–,	27	doȝora.
				2250[a]	–,	29	unarlice.
2250[b]	–,	29	þæt				
2253[a]	136,	4	drihten				
				2253[b]	136,	5	dema.
2257[a]	–,	12	lease				
2269[a]	137,	5	þu				
2302[a]	138,	35	ðeoden				
				2327[b]	140,	14	þæs.
2335[a]	140,	29	cyninȝas				
2336[a]	–,	31	þa				
				2345[a]	141,	15	metode.
2351[a]	141,	27	fæȝere				
2352[a]	–,	29	drihten				
2356[a]	142,	3	ismael				
2368[a]	–,	27	fremede				

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Genesis	Page	Line		*Genesis*	Page	Line	
2397[a]	144,	29	ædre				
2463[a]	148,	27	arones				
				2463[b]	148,	28	snytra.
2490[b]	150,	12	sona	2490[b]	150,	12	here.
				2491[a]	–,	13	burhwarena.
2512[a]	151,	21	idesum				
				2544[b]	153,	26	lean.
2559[a]	154,	21	ȝomorra				
2565[a]	–,	33	anlicnesse				
2573[a]	155,	15	ȝeworhte				
				2577[b]	155,	25	up.
				2584[a]	156,	5	hatne.
2623[b]	158,	26	his				
				2628[a]	159,	2	brinȝan.
				2628[a]	–,	2	him.
2649[a]	160,	12	unfricȝendum				
				2662[a]	161,	8	þeawfæst.
2690[a]	162,	32	þa				
2693[a]	163,	4	baldor	2693[a]	163,	4	ȝumena.
				2693[b]	–,	5	ȝuð.
2759[b]	167,	1	feran				
2767[b]	–,	17	on				
				2769[a]	167,	21	wuldortorht.
2770[a]	–,	23	cynne				
				2771[a]	–,	25	weox.
2783[b]	168,	16	siððan				
2784[a]	–,	17	ellor	2784[a]	168,	17	aȝar.
2789[b]	–,	28	lice				
2826[a]	171,	10	alwalda				
2831[a]	–,	20	abraham				
2845[a]	172,	16	rinces				
2847[a]	–,	20	æðelinȝes				
2889[a]	175,	2	sweord				
				2893[b]	175,	11	swa.
				2911[a]	176,	13	ofstum.
				2912[a]	–,	15	wuldorȝast.
				2926[b]	177,	8	rom.
2929[a]	177,	13	ȝenam				
				2933[a]	–,	21	lac.
Exodus				*Exodus*			
9[b]	178,	10	sylfes				
25[a]	179,	7	worhte				
34[a]	–,	24	ȝedrenced				

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Exodus	Page	Line		*Exodus*	Page	Line	
56[a]	181,	4	folċe	56[a]	181,	4	þy.
				61[a]	–,	14	mearchofu.
64[a]	–,	20	feondum				
				70[a]	182,	3	forbærned.
				86[a]	183,	4	wuldre.
				108[b]	184,	17	wundor.
109[a]	184,	17	syllic				
				142[b]	186,	22	inȝefolca.
158[b]	187,	33	tredan				
				161[a]	188,	1	hwæl.
				197[a]	190,	10	ȝemynted.
197[b]	190,	10	þam				
				209[a]	191,	3	healfa.
288[a]	196,	7	ece				
				288[b]	196,	7	yðe.
341[a]	199,	19	simeones				
364[a]	200,	29	deopestan				
376[a]	201,	22	heofonum				
381[b]	202,	1	feor	381[b]	202,	1	neah.
391[a]	–,	26	ȝetimbrede				
393[b]	–,	24	on				
				412[b]	204,	2	reodan.
413[a]	204,	2	maȝan	413[a]	–,	3	mece.
				447[b]	206,	4	deaðe.
509[a]	210,	2	heoro				
				513[a]	210,	10	-bodan.
				570[a]	214,	16	feonda.
				572[a]	–,	20	brimu.
Daniel				*Daniel*			
				35[b]	218,	8	ærþon.
38[b]	218,	12	þære				
43[a]	–,	22	israela				
61[a]	219,	27	ȝestreona	61[a]	219,	27	ȝestrudan.
62[a]	–,	29	eorlas				
66[a]	220,	4	freos				
69[b]	–,	11	weȝas				
79[a]	–,	30	secan				
				106[a]	222,	17	eȝesful.
134[a]	224,	10	unbliðe				
				154[b]	225,	15	ȝife.
163[a]	225,	32	daniel				
163[b]	–,	33	micelne.				

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Daniel	Page	Line		*Daniel*	Page	Line	
				164[a]	225,	34	blæd.
				182[a]	227,	5	wurðedon.
				193[a]	–,	27	wæron (?).
				203[b]	228,	17	þider.
				203[b]	–,	17	hweorfan.
				206[a]	–,	22	hearan.
				208[b]	–,	25	þe ðu þe.
				214[a]	229,	8	fyres.
214[b]	229,	9	wolde				
219[b]	–,	19	ȝelæste				
224[a]	–,	26	yrre				
				227[b]	230,	3	ȝrimmost.
233[b]	230,	15	nydde	233[b]	–,	15	ȝrome.
				234[a]	–,	16	fæðm.
252[b]	231,	25	wæron				
254[a]	232,	2	uŧan				
254[b]	–,	3	ȝehwearf	254[b]	232,	3	alet.
261[a]	–,	16	þe	261[a]	–,	16	fæðme.
				266[a]	–,	26	fyrscyde.
				274[b]	233,	11	him.
275[a]	233,	12	inne				
276[a]	–,	14	þonne				
280[a]	–,	23	azarias				
292[a]	234,	14	nu	292[a]	234,	14	ȝeorne.
293[a]	–,	16	help				
299[b]	235,	1	sittendum				
				303[a]	235,	8	lif.
303[b]	–,	8	ȝeond				
315[a]	236,	2	jacobe				
320[a]	–,	12	mæniȝeo				
				334[a]	237,	7	halȝa.
345[a]	237,	29	feondas				
366[b]	239,	7	ȝesceaft				
				396[b]	240,	34	sellende.
397[a]	240,	34	eallum				
				398[b]	241,	3	adzarias.
				412[b]	242,	1	fela.
				413[b]	–,	3	þry.
430[a]	243,	2	laðe				
				430[b]	243,	3	lenȝ.
				431[a]	–,	4	cyninȝ.
				436[a]	–,	14	leoda.
444[a]	244,	7	ȝewurðod	444[a]	244,	6	wundre.

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.			Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.		
Daniel	Page	Line		*Daniel*	Page	Line	
				444^{b}	244,	7	þe.
449^{a}	244,	16	brǽsna	450^{a}	–,	18	sinum.
				450^{b}	–,	19	aldre.
				452^{b}	–,	23	morðre.
				456^{a}	245,	1	duȝuðe.
				467^{a}	–,	22	eȝesan.
				474^{b}	246,	5	ȝesawon.
				475^{a}	–,	6	cwealme.
475^{a}	246,	5	he				
481^{a}	–,	18	ȝastum				
				489^{b}	–,	35	sel.
495^{a}	247,	10	-hyd				
505^{b}	–,	31	scylde [1]				
				509^{b}	248,	7	ufan.
				512^{b}	–,	13	weȝ.
				523^{a}	–,	33	wite.
528^{b}	249,	11	ealle				
570^{a}	251,	27	onhweorfeð				
589^{b}	252,	25	rice				
591^{b}	253,	5	þonne				
612^{a}	254,	15	eðel				
				641^{a}	256,	15	eft.
				650^{b}	–,	34	wilddeorum.
				668^{b}	257,	36	cwelm.
674^{a}	258,	11	eorla				
676^{a}	–,	15	awoc	676^{a}	258,	15	ðeode.
676^{a}	–,	17	baldazar				
683^{a}	–,	29	babilone				
708^{b}	260,	12	judea				
716^{a}	–,	27	mihtiȝran				
Satan				*Satan*			
5^{b}	265,	10	uton	5^{b}	265,	11	sæ.
12^{b}	–,	24	rim				
22^{a}	266,	14	mode				
				55^{a}	268,	14	anum.
55^{b}	268,	14	ahtest				
65^{a}	–,	36	-ðæȝn				
79^{b}	269,	27	dream				
95^{b}	270,	24	heofon				
112^{a}	271,	28	flyȝe				
112^{b}	–,	29	ðraȝum	112^{b}	271,	29	flyhte.

[1] Grein, *scilde.*

Grein.	Point added by Thorpe.	Grein.	Point omitted by Thorpe.
Satan	Page Line	*Satan*	Page Line
113[a]	272, 1 neosan	113[a]	272, 1 earda.
		113[b]	–, 2 ma.
114[a]	–, 2 þe		
125[b]	–, 26 ȝelomp		
		213[b]	277, 32 seo.
236[b]	279, 11 -mælum		
280[a]	282, 1 ȝnornedon		
280[a] to 286[b]	Points from p. 282, l. 1 to l. 14 inclusive, all		
287[b] to 295[a]	omitted in Jun. xi; also from l. 16 to l.		
296[a] to 297[a]	31; and from l. 33 to l. 35.		
299[a]	283, 3 eorðan		
301[a]	–, 7 ȝastlice		
301[b]	–, 8 cumað		
302[b]	–, 10 moton		
303[ab]	The points of lines 11,		
304[a];	12, 13, and of 22, 23,		
308[b]..	24, 25, 27, and 29 not		
310[a]	in Jun. xi.		
311[b];			
312[b]			
371[b]	287, 22 swearte	371[b]	287, 23 ȝeþohte.
372[a]	–, 23 wolde		
378[b]	288, 10 andwlitan		
442[a]	292, 17 ordfruma		
		489[a]	295, 20 ȝereaw.
		490[a]	–, 21 carcernes.
497[a]	296, 4 fela		
		497[b]	296, 5 teonan.
530[a]	298, 8 stod	530[a]	298, 8 upp.
554[b]	299, 24 aȝan		
		559[b]	300, 4 folȝað.
		594[a]	302, 6 hycȝan.
615[a]	303, 18 ȝesenað		
648[a]	305, 17 torht	648[a]	305, 17 sweȝle.
664[a]	306, 14 aldor		
666[a]	–, 18 ȝeþrowode		
679[a]	307, 12 liht[1]	679[a]	307, 12 lifiȝendum.
704[a]	309, 3 sid		
731[b]	310, 23 ȝastas	731[b]	310, 23 weriȝan.

[1] Grein. *leoht.*

Character of the Points.

The metrical points in Junius XI, pp. 1 to 212 (the part of the MS. containing the *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* poems), are lozenge-shaped and of a good size. They were evidently put in by the same bold hand which wrote the MS. Those in the second part of the MS. containing the *Satan*, which is written in a smaller and inferior hand, are mere dots. In many cases the dots are rendered more noticeable by the mark ✓ above them (compare those in Sir F. Madden's *Layamon*). Occasionally this mark appears without the dot, when two words belonging to different half-verses have been written close together.

The lozenge-shape of the points in the first portion of the MS. is often imperfect, but for the most part comes out distinctly enough when examined under a microscope. Sometimes the points are small, especially when they occur at the end of the finishing stroke of an *a*, &c. In these cases it is difficult to decide whether the scribe meant anything by them or not. I have, however, thought it best to include all instances in which the point is clearly an ink mark, and not a mere stain or speck in the parchment. Small points are those at *mod*, (*Genesis* 53^{b}); *engyl*, (*Genesis* 262^{a}); *snytra*, (*Genesis* 2463^{b}); *yðe*, (*Exodus* 288^{b}); *halga*, (*Daniel* 334^{a}); *sel*, (*Daniel* 489^{b}); *þridde*, (*Daniel* 676^{b}); *folgað*, (*Satan* 559^{b}). These have all been omitted by Thorpe. Wherever in the MS. there is any fair semblance of a point to agree with Thorpe's pointing I have allowed it to pass, although in some cases, e. g. *rice*, (*Daniel* 589) the point is of the smallest. Here and there a point has apparently been erased, e. g. after *mode*, (*Genesis*, 47^{b}); *lease*, *Genesis*, 2257^{a}; *tredan*, (*Exodus*, 158); *gelæste*, (*Daniel* 219); also perhaps at *gyt*, (*Genesis* 155^{b}), where after the *t* there are the partly erased letters of a word written in error. At *siðe*, (*Genesis* 319^{a}) and *his*, (*Genesis* 2623^{b}), instead of the usual points, we have commas to indicate that the succeeding words *fylde* and *sweostor* respectively, which follow too closely, are separate words. The point at *þry*, (*Daniel* 413), is perhaps not met-

rical. It was customary to mark off numerals with dots. Thus, in the *Béowulf* MS. we have ·xv· (ver. 207), ·xii· (ver. 1868), ·xxx· (ver. 379). So in Junius XI we have ·*þry*·, (*Daniel* 272) and in the Exeter book ·iii·, (*Az.* 171), ·iiii·, (*Az.* 174), ·*þry*·, (*Az.* 155). (Cp. also the numbers of the Cantos in the *Béowulf* MS.)

I have not included among the metrical points omitted by Thorpe a curious mark after *þurh*, (*Daniel* 595), which looks like the commencement of some letter, perhaps of the down stroke of a *t*. On the other hand I have included the case of *wæron*, (*Daniel* 193), but with a query. The mark here, when looked at through a microscope, is seen to be pear-shaped, altogether different in appearance from the usual lozenge-shaped point. The point at *fæðm*, (*Daniel* 234) is much the same shape.

Discussion of differences between Thorpe and Junius XI.

§ 1. In discussing the contents of the foregoing table I propose to leave the *Satan* poem out of the account.

Taking first the left-hand columns, it will be seen that we have 191 references to first half-verses (marked *a*) and 77 to second half-verses (marked *b*).

The former number includes all the cases in which a mid-point omitted in the MS. has been supplied by Thorpe. To ascertain the exact number of MS. omissions the following deductions must, however, be made:—45 for verses in which the MS. has also a mid-point though not in the same position as Thorpe; 7 for cases in which Thorpe has erroneously placed the end-point of a verse after the commencement of the one next following, according to Grein's division, viz. *Genesis* 764ª, 907ª, 1857ª, 2092ª, *Exodus* 109ª, 413ª, *Daniel* 475ª; and 1 for *Daniel* 276ª where a quite superfluous point has been inserted by Thorpe in the *Auftakt* of a verse, so creating an entirely disconnected half-verse: in all 53. We have remaining 138 instances in which the scribe of Junius XI neglected to put in a mid-point, not a great number out of the 4289 verses in the three poems, being less than 3·25 per cent. In the case of the end-points

the total is much smaller still, viz. 37 (or less than 1%), since from the number 77 above given we must subtract 40 for cases in which the MS. gives an end-point but not after the same word as Thorpe.

§ 2. Where the MS. and Thorpe are at variance as to the right position of an end-point, Grein's division generally agrees with the former. With regard to the cæsuræ, Grein, as a rule, gives no indication, but there can be no doubt that here again Thorpe has, for the most part, changed the manuscript pointing for the worse. In some instances, however, it is apparently at fault, coming too early in *Genesis* 618, 651, 1255, 1401, 1974, 2247, 2693, 2784, *Daniel* 61, 676, and too late in *Genesis* 53, 1521, 1697, 2463, *Daniel* 430, 512, in all of which cases the scribe has overlooked the main cæsura and given a point at a sub-cæsura. Upon this sub-cæsura, or division of the half-verse, something will be said later on, when we shall have occasion to notice the verses in which both it and the main cæsura have been marked in the MS.

What seems a curious mistake in pointing has been made in *Exodus* 56 where the MS. reads: *Ofertor he mid þý· folce fæstenâ worn·* I can only suppose that the scribe was in a careless mood for the moment, as indeed the character of the accents also seems to show. Possibly some reminiscence of such a verse as *Genesis* 471ª: *swâ him æfter þý·* may have been floating in his mind as he wrote. It is noteworthy that in verse 21ª *Ofercom he mid þy campe·* there is also a point after the article, though not of the normal shape and size; moreover, in this case, the point at the main cæsura has not been forgotten. In the other cases of difference between Thorpe and Jun. XI. in regard to the main cæsura, the MS. division, if not correct, is at least defensible. They are as follows:—

i. *Genesis* 30, 262, 955. In these three cases the syntax is clearly in favour of the MS. division, to which, moreover, no objection can be made on the ground of metre, since first half-verses of precisely the same character as it gives

are to be found also in *Béowulf* (cf. *P.B.B.* x. 284 ff.); on the other hand, against Thorpe's pointing of *Genesis* 30 compare *P.B.B.* x. 242, § 16, where objection is made to a word like *únrǽd* in a B. verse.

ii. *Genesis* 72. Here Thorpe's division (with which, strange to say, both Grein and Bouterwek agree) gives us two alliterating words in the second half-verse to one in the first, a thing which Rieger (p. 9) finds to occur only once in the *Genesis*, viz. ver. 2321. The MS. division at *swearte* and *þorfton* is the correct one (cp. *P.B.B.* x. 512). Against the resulting *enjambement* (of 72^{b}, 73^{a}) nothing can be said. For a sentence to terminate, as at *siðe*, in the middle of a half-verse is certainly unusual, but occurs again *Genesis* 2567^{b}, 2568^{a}, *þær hie strang begeat· wite, þæs heo wordum.*

iii. *Genesis* 133. Thorpe divides as Rieger (p. 39), so obtaining an impossible half-verse *dæg ǽresta geseah*: ´ ´ ˋ × × ´ (For the secondary accent in *ǽresta* cp. *P.B.B.* x. 228, 229. For the length of *dæg* in this position see Paul in *P.B.B.* viii. 184, note.)

iv. *Genesis* 475. Thorpe and Grein divide at *witode*, the latter supplying *tîres* (!) in the second half-verse (in the *Glossar*, p. 472, *wuldres* is suggested), so avoiding the confusion into which Thorpe is led by his false pointing. The MS. division is unobjectionable, the half-verse *him to wæron·* being quite a possible A^{3} verse (cp. *P.B.B.* x. 284) even without *habban* (see § 4, i).

v. *Genesis* 555. Thorpe divides at *he*, Grein and Bouterwek, apparently, at *ærende*, where they place a comma. Thorpe is clearly wrong. The scribe points at *swa*, taking the word closely with *hwilc* in the sense of *whatso, whatsoever* (cp. *swa hwylce daga*: Ps. 1374=*in quacunque die*: Grein iv. 499, § 11), which is the best way.

vi. *Genesis* 1601. This is really a long verse of three half-verses: ´ × × × ´ × | × ´ × ´ | × × ´ × ´ |. Thorpe divides at the end of the first, Grein and the MS. at the end of the second. (Cp. *P.B.B.* xii. 476.)

vii. *Daniel* 292. Here there is a conflict between syntax and prosody as in *Genesis* 72. Thorpe and Grein point according to syntax, obtaining a first half-verse of the unusual form $\acute{}\times\times\ |\ \acute{}\times\grave{}\|$. The scribe separates the adverb from its clause by the metrical point, which is certainly awkward.

viii. *Daniel* 261. Thorpe and Grein (*Glossar*, p. 574, § 2), take *þæs . . þe* as the genitive of the relative *sê þe*, but I query if the enclitic *þe* can so be separated, and in any case if it is strong enough to bear the second chief accent of the half-verse, which it must do according to their arrangement. The MS. points at *fæðme*, taking *þe* no doubt as a conjunction and *þæs* as demonstrative: *The young men praised God that under his shelter was driven away*, &c.

ix. *Genesis* 356, 398; *Daniel* 206. Thorpe neglects the cæsural point of the MS. in these three verses, taking them as merely half-verses; Grein, on the other hand, as long, agreeing with the MS.

Exodus 413. Point again neglected by Thorpe: Grein divides as MS.

Genesis 2628[a]: regarded as merely a half-verse by Thorpe and Grein; by MS. as a full verse. According to Sievers, however, *heht bringan* is too short for a half-verse. Moreover the alliteration of the governing verb instead of the infinitive is irregular.

x. The following instances of deviation on the part of Thorpe need no discussion, the MS. pointing being obviously correct in every case; viz. *Genesis* 567, 748, 882, 1023, 2250; *Exodus* 86, 197, 513; *Daniel* 266, 303.

xi. *Genesis* 2253 and *Exodus* 288 are corrupt passages.

§ 3. The instances in which Grein has restored the MS. division where Thorpe had altered the position of an end-point are as follows—*Genesis* 71, 345, 475, 606, 643, 659, 702, 713, 763, 836, 893, 906, 913, 914, 1023, 1856, 2047, 2091, 2577; *Exodus* 108, 142, 412; *Daniel* 35, 396, 398, 474. These we need not go into.

The MS. divides too early in *Genesis* 487, 1832, 1964, 2037, 2229, 2490; *Daniel* 233, 254 (in each case pointing at the middle pause of the half-verse); and too late in *Genesis* 1316, 1759. As regards *Genesis* 1964, it is worth remarking how often the scribe omits a metrical point after the word *þa*; cp. *Genesis* 965, 1697, 2172, 2336, 2690. The pointing of *Genesis* 1316, 1759 is indefensible if it was intended to indicate where verses 1315, 1758, respectively, close. Probably, however, we have here the extra point before alliteration of which examples will be mentioned below.

In a few other cases Grein (as well as Thorpe) differs from the MS., viz. in the end-division of *Genesis* 72, 474, 1446, 2182. As to the first of these cp. § 2, ii; the others will need a few words.

i. *Genesis* 474. Thorpe and Grein divide at *habban*, the MS. at *worulde*. The former division makes 474^{b} a *Schwellvers* $\acute{\times} \mid \breve{\times} \times \mid \acute{\times}$, though Sievers does not notice it as such (*P.B.B.* xii. 454 ff.); the latter leads to an awkward break in the syntax of 475^{a} (cp. however § 2 ii. and vii.).

ii. *Genesis* 1446. This case is much the same. Dividing at *eft*, as Thorpe does, we get an irregular half-verse, viz. B with minor accent in middle thesis: $\times \acute{-} \breve{\times} \acute{-}$; (cp. *P.B.B.* x. 242 § 16). Carrying *eft* into the next half-verse as the MS. does produces a strong syntactic pause in the *Auftakt* of 1446^{b}.

iii. *Genesis* 2182, 2183. Thorpe and Grein arrange these as two verses, each with a *Schwellvers* in the second half; the MS. as three normal verses thus:—

fægen freobearnum.
fæste mynteð · ingeþancum · þe me æfter sie · eafo
ran síne · yrfeweardas.—(*Junius* xi, p. 100, lines 1, 2, 3.)

The scribe's division is of course the right one. Prof. Sievers (in *P.B.B.* x. 476) says that in *Germ.* x. 417 Grein has corrected his former arrangement. I have no means of consulting this, but no doubt it will give the verses as above*.

* It does do so.

Our examination so far has, I think, made it clear that the scribe of Junius XI possessed a more accurate knowledge of the *ars metrica* of our fathers than any of his editors has had.

In the next section I hope to show that had his pointing been in all cases strictly attended to a vast amount of misdirected ingenuity which has been spent over metrical theories might have been spared.

§ 4. We have now to consider the verses in which the MS. has extra pointing beyond what it usually gives at the end of each half-verse. It will be seen that in many cases these verses are of an abnormal length belonging to the so-called *Schwellverse*. These I must refrain, for the present, from discussing fully. As, however, Prof. Sievers's system of scansion is the one generally accepted to-day, I shall classify them, as far as possible, according to it. The ordinary verses with extra pointing will be treated at more length. I give first the instances in which the extra pointing appears in a first half-verse:—

X.

1. *Genesis* 9ª: so*ðfæst . and swiðferom*[1].
2. „ 156ª: *wid lond . ne weȝas nytte.*
3. „ 395ª: *he hæfð nu ȝemearcod . anne middanȝeard.*
4. „ 401ª: *ne ȝelyfe ic me nu . þæs leohtes furðor.*
5. „ 403ª: *þæt we mihtiȝes ȝodes . mod onwœcen.*
6. „ 405ª: *þæt hie þæt onwendon þæt he mid his worde bebead.*
7. „ 408ª: f*ira bearn . on þissum fæstum clomme.*
8. „ 507ª: *hæfst þe wið drihten . dyrne ȝeworhtne.*
9. „ 759ª: hyȝe *ymb heortan . ȝerume.*
10. „ 969ª: *cain . and abel.*
11. „ 1077ª: a*da . and sella.*
12. „ 1400ª: *þam at niehstan . wæs.*
13. „ 1547ª: *olla . olliva.*
14. „ 1617ª: ch*us . and cham.*

[1] I regret that I have not in all cases noted the exact page and line in the MS. where these examples occur. They will be easily found, however, by aid of Thorpe's edition, which gives the MS. pagination in bracketed numbers. Grein gives that of Thorpe similarly; so that with the two editions and the MS. combined, no trouble will be experienced in verifying the subsidiary pointing to which attention is here called.

15. *Genesis* 1654ª : æðelinȝa . *bearn.*
16. „ 2016ª : *þara þe* læddon . *loth.*
17. „ 2027ª : *aner . and manre.*
18. „ 2149ª : *ac þu most* heonon . *huðe lædan.*
19. „ 2173ª : dæd *rof* . *drihtne sinum.*
20. „ 2249ª : *drehta* doȝora . ȝeham.
21. „ 2345ª : *he þa* metode . *oncwæð.*
22. „ 2584ª : *wylmhatne . liȝ.*
23. „ 2662ª : *þeawfæst . and* ȝeþyldiȝ.
24. „ 2769ª : *wuldor torht . ymb* wucan.
25. „ 2771ª : *cniht weox . and þaȝ.*
26. „ 2911ª : *him þa* ofstum . *to.*
27. „ 2912ª : *wuldorȝast . ȝodes.*
28. „ 2933ª : *onbleot þæt* lac . *ȝode.*
29. *Exodus* 61ª : mearchofu . *morheald.*
30. „ 70ª : *forbœrned* . burhhleoðu.
31. „ 161ª : *on* hwæl . *hwreopán.*
32. „ 209ª : *þeah þe him on* healfa . ȝehwam.
33. „ 570ª : *feorh of* feonda . *dome.*
34. „ 572ª : *ealle him* brimu . *blodiȝe þuhton.*
35. *Daniel* 106ª : eȝesful . *ylda bearnum.*
36. „ 164ª : blæd . *in Babilonia.*
37. „ 182ª : *wurðedon* . wihȝyld.
38. „ 214ª : *frecne . fyres . wylm.*
39. „ 234ª : *in* fæðm . *fyres liȝe.*
40. „ 431ª : *het þa se cyniȝ . to him.*
41. „ 436ª : laðsearo *leoda . cyniȝes.*
42. „ 444ª : *hæfde on þam* wundre . ȝewurðod *þe .*
43. „ 450ª : swiðmod *sinum . leodum.*
44. „ 456ª : dom weard *æfter* duȝuðe . ȝecyðed.
45. „ 467ª : *wið þæs* eȝesan . *ȝryre.*
46. „ 475ª : *þæt he wið cwealme . ȝebearh.*
47. „ 523ª : wite . wealdeð.
48. „ 641ª : *þa wæs eft . ȝeseted.*

The following have extra pointing in the second half-verse :

Y.

1. *Genesis* 284ᵇ : *þa ne willað me æt þam* striðe . ȝeswican.
2. „ 425ᵇ : *þæt me is on* mode . *minum swa sar.*
(Thorpe, Grein, Bouterwek, all read : *on minum mode.*)
3. „ 706ᵇ : *þæt he þam* ȝehate . ȝetruwode.
4. „ 730ᵇ : *nu hie* wordcwyde . *his.*
5. „ 755ᵇ : *swa hwæt swa wit her* morðres . *poliað.*
6. „ 839ᵇ : *uton* ȝan *on þysne* weald . *innan.*
7. „ 1476ᵇ : *þa ȝyt se* eaðeȝa . *wer.*

Y. 8. *Genesis* 1551ᵇ: sem · *and* cham.
9. „ 1593ᵇ: onȝan þa his selfes · bearn.
10. „ 1692ᵇ: ac hie earm·lice.
11. „ 1723ᵇ: þæs þe us secȝeað · bec. (Grein: *swa us*, &c.)
12. „ 1818ᵇ: drohtað · secan.
13. „ 1825ᵇ: wlance · moniȝe.
14. „ 1972ᵇ: bennum · seoce.
15. „ 2027ᵇ: escol · þriddan. (cp. 2027ᵃ)
16. „ 2142ᵇ: nis worild feoh · þe ic me aȝan wille.
17. „ 2544ᵇ: him þæs lean · forȝeald.
18. „ 2577ᵇ: he ȝeseah from foldan · up.
19. „ 2628ᵇ: to him · selfum.
20. „ 2693ᵇ: ȝuð·bordes swenȝ.
21. „ 2926ᵇ: and him þær rom · ȝeseah.
22. *Exodus* 381ᵇ: eac þon neah · and feor.
23. „ 447ᵇ: ȝeofon deaðe · hweop.
24. *Daniel* 35ᵇ: þa þe on fruman · ærðon.
25. „ 154ᵇ: ȝife · of heofnum.
26. „ 227ᵇ: swa he grimmost · mihte.
27. „ 412ᵇ: þæt eower fela · ȝeseah.
28. „ 450ᵇ: þæt se wære his aldre · scyldiȝ. (cp. 450ᵃ)
29. „ 452ᵇ: se hie of þam morðre · alysde.
30. „ 489ᵇ: no þy sel · dyde.
31. „ 509ᵇ: ufan · of roderum.
32. „ 650ᵇ: þe he mid wilddeorum · ateah.
33. „ 668ᵇ: oð þæt him cwelm · ȝesceod.

In *Genesis* 2893: *þæt he ge*dæde· *swa· hine* drihten *het*· it is difficult to see to which half-verse the scribe intended *swa* to belong; but I imagine it was to the first. Indeed I am not sure that there is a point at *gedæde*, the end of which, as well as the *s* of *swa*, is partly obscured by a stain. In *Daniel* 413ᵇ *þæt we* þry· *sendon*· the extra point is probably numerical. So in *Daniel* 272 we have ·ðry· with the ordinary two points: (cp. above, page 15, lines 1–5). The additional point occasionally occurs before the chief letter in the second half-verse, but only when this is of an extended character. In first half-verses, with the exception of *Genesis* 1316ᵃ, 1759ᵃ (already mentioned), I have not noticed anything similar except in:

1. *Genesis* 1712ᵃ: *þa* wearð · áárone.
2. *Daniel* 193ᵃ: *þa* wæron · æðelum.

both of which cases are doubtful. The point at *weard* is very small, though in the usual ink, and not merely a speck in the parchment. That at *wæron* as we have said (p. 15), is not of the usual lozenge-shape, but is shaped like a pear with a stem. There is a mark somewhat like it, but apple-shaped, under the *a* of *forgeaf*, *Exodus* 11ᵇ. The examples I have found in second half-verses are:

Z. 1. *Genesis* 285ᵇ: *hie habbaþ me · to hearran ȝecorene.*
2. „ 291ᵇ: *ne wille ic lenȝ · his geonȝra wurþan.*
3. „ 403ᵇ: *Uton oþwendan hit nu · monna bearnum.*
4. „ 507ᵇ: *ic ȝehyrde hine · þine dæd and word.*
5. „ 558ᵇ: *þy ic wat þæt he inc · abolȝen wyrþ.*
6. „ 649ᵇ: *þæt heo onȝan · his wordum truwian.*
7. „ 759ᵇ: *ealle synt uncre · hearmas ȝewrecene.*
8. „ 760ᵇ: *nu wille ic eft · þam liȝe near.*
9. „ 1107ᵇ: *and his · yldrum þah.*
10. „ 1546ᵇ: *nemde wæron · þeoba.*
11. „ 1726ᵇ: *no hwæðre · gifeðe weard*
12. „ 2327ᵇ: *ne þearf þe þæs · eaforan sceomiȝan.*
13. *Daniel* 203ᵇ: *þæt hie þider · hweorfan wolden.*
14. „ 208ᵇ: *þe ðu þe · to wundrum teodest.*
15. „ 274ᵇ: *him · þær owiht ne derede.*

Besides these we have *Genesis* 1956ᵃ *þe him æfter·mundbyrde a*, where *mundbyrde* is Grein's emendation, the passage being plainly corrupt.

Mentioned as *Schwellverse* by Sievers in his article (*P.B.B.* xii. 454 . . 482) are:—

X. 2. *Genesis* 156ᵃ: Type C ˊ ‖ . . . × ˊ | ◡ × . with *zweisilbige innere Senkung*, *Nebenton* (lond) and *Auflösung* (wegas = ◡ ×). Cp. *P.B.B.* xii. 469.
3. „ 395ᵃ: Type B ˊ ‖ . . . × ˊ | . × ˊ, or better ˊ × . . . ‖ ˊ × . | ˊ . (p. 471), with *viersilbiger Auftakt* (p. 480).
6. „ 405ᵃ: B verse (*typus*: 4 *Auftakt* + 5 + 2 !)—(p. 480).
7. „ 408ᵃ: Type A ˊ × . . ‖ ˊ × . | ˊ × . with *Nebenton* (bearn) *in erster Senkung* which is *viersilbig* (p. 479).
18. „ 2149ᵃ. A corrupt passage (p. 476).
19. „ 2173ᵃ = A a 1 with *Nebenton* (rof) *in erster Senkung* (459)
33. *Exodus* 570ᵃ = A a 1 (p. 459).
34. „ 572ᵃ: Type A, the words *ealle him* being suppressed (476).

39. *Daniel* 234[a]: Either A, with extra foot (prefixed) × ⏝́ or (?) lengthened C × ⏝́ | ⏝́ × . ‖ ⏝́ × . (468).
41. „ 436[a]: A a 2 a with *Nebenton* (searo) *in erster Senkung* (461).
42. „ 444[a]: Taken as a second half-verse by Sievers, and incorrectly given under sub-type A a 2 b, instead of under A a 4 b (462).
43. „ 450[a]: A a 1 with *Nebenton* (mod); (459).
44. „ 456[a]: A b 9 a: with *Auflösung* (duʒuc̆e); (464).

Y. 1. *Genesis* 284[b]: A b? (p. 479).
16. „ 2142[b]: Can be reckoned as A, but is perhaps corrupt (476).
26. *Daniel* 227[b]: A a 1 (p. 459).
28. „ 450[b]: A a 4 b (p. 462).
29. „ 452[b]: A b 9 b (p. 464).

Z. 3. *Genesis* 403[b]: A a with *dreisilbiger Auftakt* (p. 480).
12. „ 2327[b]: A a 2 b with *Auftakt* and *Auflösung*, auf. 2. and 3. *Hebung* (461).
13. *Daniel* 203[b]: A a 3 b (p. 462).
14. „ 208[b]: A a 3 b (p. 462).

These are all of the verses with extra pointing that I can find mentioned in Prof. Sievers's article on the *Schwellvers*. Some of the others had certainly an equal title to appear, whilst many of those which are not actually *Schwellverse* belong to what Prof. Sievers calls *gesteigerte* types. There remain, however, many which are simply ordinary verses. In what follows I shall attempt to give such a description of each verse as Prof. Sievers himself would approve, referring, where suitable, to his articles in vols. x. and xii. of *Paul und Braunes Beiträge*.

X. 1. *Genesis* 9[a] = a *gesteigerter* E verse: E 8 a (*P.B.B.* x. 310).
4. „ 401[a] = Y 1, Gen. 284 (*P.B.B.* xii. 479).
5. „ 403[a] = a complete long verse, of two regular half-verses B + A: × × ⏝́ | × × ⏑ × ‖ ⏝́ × | ⏝́ ×.
8. „ 507[a] = the same: composed of A[3] + A: ⏝́ × × | ⏝́ × ‖ ⏝́ × × | ⏝́ ×.
9. „ 759[a] = a *Schwellvers*: A b 7 a with *Auflösung*: (*P.B.B.* xii. 463).
10. „ 969[a] = an ordinary A verse ⏝́ × | ⏝́ ×.
11. „ 1077[a] = „ „ ⏝́ × × | ⏝́ ×.
12 „ 1400[a] = a *Schwellvers* (?) B with single alliteration cp. B 2 a (xii. 472).

13. *Genesis* 1547[a] = a *gesteigerter* D: ´ × | ´ ˇ ×. (x. 302).
14. „ 1617[a] = a doubtful A verse ´ × | ´ × (*cha-am*; cp. x. 480 e.)
15. „ 1654[a] = an ordinary E verse: ˘ × ˇ × | ´.
16. „ 2016[a] = a *Schwellvers* (?) B 1, 2 b (xii. 471).
17. „ 2027[a] = an ordinary A v. ´ × × | ´ ×.
20. „ 2249[a] = *a Schwellvers*: B 1 e (xii. 471 and cp. x. 294 § 6).
21. „ 2345[a] = a *Schwellvers* (?) cp. B 2 a (cf. xii. 472: Seef. 32).
22. „ 2584[a] = an ordinary E v. ´ ˇ × | ´.
23. „ 2662[a] = a doubtful *gesteigerter* A verse with *dreisilbige Senkung* (No example in *Béowulf*, but cp. *P.B.B.* x. 310).
24. „ 2769[a] = an E verse with '*Erweiterung des ersten Fusses.*' (x. 309, 310).
25. „ 2771[a] = an ordinary E verse.
26. „ 2911[a] = a *Schwellvers* (?) cp. B 2 a (xii. 472).
27. „ 2912[a] = an E verse of form ´ × ˇ | ˘ ×. (x. 266).
28. „ 2933[a] = a *Schwellvers*: C 1 f with *Auftakt* (xii. 469).
29. *Exodus* 61[a] = *gesteigerter* A: A 19 a (x. 280).
30. „ 70[a] = „ with *Auftakt*: A 20 (x. 280).
31. „ 161[a] = an ordinary C verse, but the passage is corrupt.
32. „ 209[a] = a *Schwellvers*: B 2 with *Senkung* 3 + 2 (xii. 471).
35. *Daniel* 106[a] = „ „ A a 1 with *Auflösung* (xii. 460).
36. „ 164[a] = a *Schwellvers*: C 1 a „ „ (xii. 469). N. B. *Babilonia* to be read—*lonja*.
37. „ 182[a] = *gesteigerter* A: A. 17 a (x. 279).
38. „ 214[a] = „ D: D. 12 (x. 305).
40. „ 431[a] = a *Schwellvers* B with single alliteration?
45. „ 467[a] = an ordinary B verse.
46. „ 475[a] = a *Schwellvers* B with single alliteration, and *Senkung* 2 + 2 (cp. x. 40).
47. „ 523[a] = an ordinary A verse ´ × | ´ ×.
48. „ 641[a] = „ B „ × × ´ | × ˘ ×.

Y. 2. *Genesis* 425 = a full verse of four accents: A[3] *plus* ´ × × ´ (cp. *P. B. B.* x. 312, § 2).
3. „ 706[b] = a *Schwellvers*: Ab 9b (xii. 464),—taking *-trûwode* as *-trûwde* (Sievers, *Grammatik*, § 412, 2), or as *-trêowde*.
4. „ 730[b] = B verse with second factor of compound in *Senkung* (x. 242).
5. „ 755[b] = a *Schwellvers*: Aa 3b with *Auftakt* and *Auflösung* (xii. 462).
6. „ 839[b] = a *Schwellvers*: C 2 c with *Auftakt* (of two syllables)—(xii. 469).
7. „ 1476[b] = a *Schwellvers*: B 2 e (xii. 471).
8. „ 1551[b] = Cp. x. 14.

Y. 9. *Genesis* 1593^{b} = a *Schwellvers*: B 2b (xii. 471).
10. „ 1692^{b} = an ordinary C verse.
11. „ 1723^{b} = an ordinary B verse.
12. „ 1818^{b} = „ „ A „
13. „ 1825^{b} = „ „ „ „
14. „ 1972^{b} = „ „ „ „
15. „ 2027^{b} = „ „ „ „
17. „ 2544^{b} = „ „ B „
18. „ 2577^{b} = a *Schwellvers*: B 2 a with *Auftakt* (of two syllables): (xii. 471).
19. „ 2628^{b} = an ordinary C verse.
20. „ 2693^{b} = an ordinary E verse. The point at ȝuð is remarkable. The word occurs at the end of a line in the MS. (p. 128, l. 3), which may have something to do with the misplacement of the point. Or did the scribe wish by his pointing to bring out the subordinate crossed alliteration in the verse: *ac ic me* **g**umena · **b**aldor **g**uð · **b**ordes swenȝ.*?*
21. „ 2926^{b} = an ordinary B verse.
22. *Exodus* 381^{b} = „ „ „ „
23. „ 447^{b} = „ „ „ „
24. *Daniel* 35^{b} = „ „ C „
25. „ 154^{b} = „ „ A „
27. „ 412^{b} = „ „ B „
30. „ 489^{b} = „ „ C „
31. „ 509^{b} = „ „ A „
32. „ 650^{b} = an ordinary C verse, *plus* × ⏑ –.
33. „ 668^{b} = *Schwellvers* (or ? ordinary) B (cp. xii. 471 and x. 292).

Z. 1. *Genesis* 285^{b} = a *Schwellvers*: A b 9 b with *Auftakt* and *Auflösung*. (xii. 464).
2. „ 291^{b} = a *Schwellvers* made up of an ordinary B verse (but without alliteration) + an A verse with *Auftakt*; nearest example in Sievers, *Exodus*, 572 (xii. 476).
4. „ 507^{b} = a *Schwellvers*, B 2 with *Auftakt* of two syllables, and *Senkung* 5 (? 3) + 1 (xii. 472).
5. „ 558^{b} = a B verse without alliteration + a B verse with alliteration. Cp. Z. 2.
6. „ 648^{b} = a *Schwellvers: gesteigerter* D with *Auftakt* of three syllables. No example in Sievers.
7. „ 759^{b} = a *Schwellvers*: A b 10 b with *Auflösung* (xii. 464).
8. „ 760^{b} = Cp. Z 2 and Z 5.
9. „ 1107^{b} = an ordinary B verse; but the scribe apparently intended the words *and his.* to belong to the

first half verse, which however they cannot do without violence to Rieger's rule (*Verskunst*, p. 43).

Z. 10. „ 1546^{b}=? *erweiterter* D. cp. x. 255: *Béowulf*, 1725.
11. „ 1726^{b}=a *Schwellvers*: B 2 b with *Auflösung* (xii. 472).
15, *Daniel* 274^{b}=a *Schwellvers*: A b 7 a with *Nebenton* (or ? *ôht* for *ôwiht*; cp. *P.B.B.* x. 485) and *Auflösung* (xii. 463).

Altogether, including the examples given by Prof. Sievers, it appears that there are among the verses with extra pointing some 50 *Schwellverse*, 9 verses of a *gesteigerter* type, and about 31 ordinary verses. It is not always easy to determine in the case of B verses the limit between a Sievers ordinary, and a Sievers *Schwellvers*. Why, for example, should *Béowulf* 971^{b} *hwæðere he his folme forlet* be reckoned (*P.B.B.* x. 241) as an ordinary B verse, and *Andreas* 51^{b}: *hwæðre he in breostum þa gyt* as a *Schwellvers* (xii. 472)? This discrepancy in the treatment of B verses has been pointed out by Cremer (*Metrische Untersuchung*, Bonn, 1888, p. 25) and emphasized by Hirt (*Verskunst*, pp. 114, 115).

There is some disagreement between Prof. Sievers and his follower Dr. Luick as to the nature of the *Schwellvers*, the former considering that extension takes place through the prefixing of a foot to the normal verse, the latter through the addition of a foot after the cæsura (cp. xii. 458). Nevertheless on p. 468 of his article Prof. Sievers hints at the possibility of a *verlängertes C* $\times\acute{} \mid \acute{}\times\cdot\|\acute{}\times\cdot$ A clear example of this seems to be Y. 32, *Genesis* 650^{b}, where the additional foot is of the form $\times\acute{}$ instead of $\acute{}\times$, as usual. This verse might perhaps be referred to the B type with second factor of compound in the *Senkung* (x. 242), but not without a certain degree of violence.

It is impossible, however, not to feel that it is only by violence that certain of these verses can be brought under Prof. Sievers's five-type classification. The first of those which he mentions, viz. X. 2, *Genesis* 156^{a}, *wid lond·ne*

w*egasnytte·* is an example in point. This is put down by Prof. Sievers as a C verse with *Nebenton* in the *Senkung* (xii. 469) i.e. as ´||˃ × ◡ × | ´ × *, in spite of his own principle, enunciated on a following page (471), that '*Nebentöne schliessen sich einer vorausgehenden Hebung leichter an als einer folgenden.*'

It is clear that the MS. division of the verse is the natural one. The same remark will apply to the division of the other half-verses, the pointing of the MS. coinciding in almost every instance with the natural division. In no case is an enclitic separated from the word preceding it, and in only one instance—*Gen.* 2327^{b}—is a proclitic separated from the word which follows it. Cp. **X.** 1, 10, 48, &c., **Y.** 25, 509, 668, &c. In this respect it must be admitted that the scribe's sub-division of the half-verse as a rule answers better than that of Prof. Sievers, to what Dr. Heusler (*Ljóþaháttr*, p. 9) says is always: *Die letzte Frage der Metrik*, viz. 'How have I to read?' (*Wie hab' ich zu lesen?*) For example Prof. Sievers would scan *Dan.* 154^{b}, g*ife· of heofnum·* as an A verse, ◡ × × | ´ ×, and again, *Gen.* 1400^{a}: *þam at niehstan· wæs·* as a B verse, × × ´ | × ´; in the former case placing a proclitic syllable in the same foot with the word preceding it, in the latter separating a final syllable from its own word to connect it with the word following. This might be excusable if the alliterative verse cæsura resembled that of the Greek and Latin hexameter, which divides the verse in a place where the end of a word coincides with the middle of a foot; but as the O. E. long verse is never divided in this way, we have no reason to suppose that the half-verse is either. Prof. Sievers, it is true, never, as far as I am aware, makes actual mention of the sub-cæsura, though by the way he represents the various types of half-verse (´ × | ´ ×, ´ | ´ × × &c.) he seems to imply its theoretical existence. Practically, both cæsuræ—principal (including middle and final) and sc-

* Corrected in *Altgermanische Metrik* § 95, 10 to Typus AC ´ × ... ´´ ×.

condary—would be, I suppose, ignored in the delivery if, as Prof. Sievers thinks, this resembled our modern method of recitation, and was not performed in measured time. For my own part, when listening to Racine's *Andromaque* at the Théâtre Français, I lost all sense that it was verse which was being recited; metre and rhyme both disappeared in the flow of declamation[1]. Such must have been *a fortiori* the fate of the alliteration, also, if the Old English verse was recited in the manner that Prof. Sievers supposes, not to speak of unnatural accents, such as that on *wæs* in *Béowulf* 823, *þæt his áldres wǽs énde gezóngen.*

But even in France this mode of recitation is a thing of modern introduction. M. Larroumet (*Andromaque, Notice Historique*, p. 37) tells us that before the time of Molière, *on chantait les vers tragiques plus qu'on ne les disait*, and he quotes a remark from Talma to the effect that the actor Lekain (admitted to the Comédie Française in 1750) following out the reform in part introduced by Baron, combated in his turn '*cette déclamation redondante et fastueuse, cette diction chantante et martelée, où le profond respect pour la césure faisait tomber régulièrement les vers en cadence.*'

If this was the style of recitation in France as late as 1750, it seems most unlikely that in England, in the centuries before the Conquest, the modern oratorical method of delivery was already practised, especially when we remember that our old poems were recited by *scops* in some cases if not invariably themselves poets (*léoðwyrhtan*). Such men would have a tender regard for the form of the verses they sang—to give the correct word, and the one which we have the authority of the *Béowulf* itself for using (cp. vv. 90, 496)—and would certainly not deliver them so as to make what had cost so much care to construct indistinguishable from the prose of ordinary life. It is proverbial that a poet,

[1] Since printing the above I find in the *Contemporary* for September, p. 388, a description of Sarah Bernhardt's mode of reciting, entirely bearing out what I say. The writer thinks it 'reprehensible (at any rate from the author's standpoint).'

especially when giving forth his own effusions, is particular to bring out the metre. The poet Coleridge was an example of this. Mr. Collier (*Lectures on Shakspere*, p. 62) tells us Coleridge insisted that poetry should be read with intonation, and that his own reading of Spenser (for example) '*almost amounted to a song.*' And the reason given by Coleridge for this was that '*a poet writes in measure, and measure is best made apparent by reading with a tone*' (*ib.* p. 63).

Prof. Sievers's hypothesis is therefore antecedently so improbable, that until much stronger reasons have been brought forward in support of it, than we have as yet heard, we are justified in setting it aside. Prof. Möller of Copenhagen has argued against it with a force and fulness which leave nothing to be desired (*Zur ahd. Alliterationspoesie*, pp. 146, 149. See also Dr. Heusler's *Ljóþaháttr*, pp. 14, 17). Into his argument I cannot enter now, but to what has already been said I may add that the *parallelism* so common in O. E. alliterative verse must have compelled a strict attention to the cæsuræ on the part of the *scop*. How otherwise could such passages as *Exodus* 1–7, or *Elene* 99–104, have been made intelligible to an audience? The occurrence now and then of *enjambements* cannot, I submit, weigh against such a consideration as this.

It seems to me, therefore, safe to assume that the ordinary points in MS. *Junius XI* represent actual metrical pauses which were made in chanting the verses, and further, that the extra-ordinary points which we have been considering represent the same thing. In this case it is not difficult to see on what principle, in the scribe's view at least, the half-verse was constructed. His pointing is a complete endorsement of the view that the half-verse is *zweigliedrig* (Heusler: *Altd. Verskunst*). The extra point marks the *innere Cäsur* of which Prof. Möller speaks (*Zur ahd. Alliterationspoesie*, p. 120), by means of which *der germanische Halbvers zerfiel in zwei Füsse* (on p. 171 note, by preference, *Glieder*) *wie der Vers in zwei Halbverse.*

In other words, the half-verse is symmetrical with the whole verse. As the latter is divided by a cæsura into two parts, each of which may, at will, commence with an accented syllable, or with one or more unaccented syllables forming an *Auftakt*, so is the former, though in this case the unaccented syllables (*der innere Auftakt*) will of course be light.

This being so, we may arrange the ordinary half-verses (in **X** and **Y**) as follows:

	Auftakt.	1*st Arsis.*	*Inner Auftakt.*	2*nd Arsis.*
X. 10. *Gen.* 969[a]	–	Cain .	and	Abel .
12. ,, 1400[a]	þam at	niehstan .	–	wæs .
21. ,, 2345[a]	he þa	metode .	on-	cwæð .
22. ,, 2584[a]	–	wylmhatne .	–	liȝ .
23. ,, 2662[a]	–	þeawfæst .	and ȝe-	þyldiȝ.
26. ,, 2912[a]	him þa	ofstum .	–	to .
48. *Dan.* 641[a]	þa wæs	eft .	ȝe-	seted .
Y. 10. *Gen.* 1692[b]	ac hie	earm .	–	lice .
11. ,, 1723[b]	þæs þe us	secȝeað .	–	bec .
12. ,, 1818[b]	–	drohtað .	–	secan .
25. *Dan.* 154[b]	–	ȝife .	of	heofnum .

&c., &c.

Similarly can be arranged some of the verses mentioned above (§§ 2 and 3), in which the pointing comes earlier or later than we should have expected it, viz.—

	Auftakt.	1*st Arsis.*	*Inner Auftakt.*	2*nd Arsis.*
Gen. 651[a]	þæt he þa	bysene .	from	ȝode
,, 1401[a]	nymðe	hea wæs .	a-	hafen
,, 2247[a]	siððan	Aȝar .	–	þe
,, 2693[a]	ac ic me	ȝumena .	–	baldor
,, 53[b]	–	mod .	ȝe-	twæfde
,, 1521[b]	–	ærest .	be-	ȝrindeð
,, 1832[b]	þæt þu sie	sweostor .	–	min

&c., &c.

The most striking evidence of the pause in the middle of the half-verse is that given in *Gen.* 1692[b], *ac hie earm·lice*· I may say that both points are perfectly distinct and normal in the MS. The example is unique (except for the some-

what confusing point in *Gen.* 2693[b], *guð-bordes swenge*), but we may compare with it *Destruction of Troy* v. 3097[b], *halfe so luffable*, where Dr. Luick considers the doubling of the *f* a sign that the consonant was to be pronounced without voice, and therefore that the syllable *luff-* was to be followed by a pause. He says (*Anglia*, xi. p. 408) '*Man musste offenbar nach der ersten silbe etwas absetzen, so dass das wort fast in zwei getrennt wurde; die spirans kam in den auslaut: daher die seltsame schreibung*[1].'

I quote this passage as being interesting rather than conclusive. A stronger confirmation of the *Zweigliedrigkeit* for which we are arguing is the existence of such a half-verse as the first of *Exodus* 118:

hár hæð . *holmegum wederum* .

Prof. Sievers, indeed, *P.B.B.* x. 513 says that *Ex.* 118[a] is *kein mögliches Hemistich*, which is certainly true if the five types (A, B, &c.) exhaust the forms of verse that were at the disposal of our old poets. It must be admitted that so curt a half-verse is rare in O. E. poetry. In Old Norse it was more frequent, e.g. *Hǫv.* 77, *Deyr fé*, *Hǫv.* 52, *miket eitt* (cp. Heusler, *Ljóþaháttr* pp. 81, 18). But I cannot perceive that its introduction is at all hurtful to the rhythm of the passage in *Exodus* where it occurs; on the contrary, it gives an impressive effect which is quite lost by substituting the genitives *hâres*, *hæðes*, as Prof. Sievers proposes. The opening verse of the well-known Scotch song

'*All the Blue Bonnets are over the Border*,'

has very much the same rhythm, viz.

March, march, || *Ettrick and Teviotdale*

which is sung, and can just as easily be recited, in the following time:—

[1] A friend has expressed to me doubts whether Dr. Luick's inference is here sound; I may mention, however, that Mr. Sweet (*Hist. Eng. Sounds*, p. 166) remarks, 'In *effter* the doubling of the *f* may mean voicelessness.'

Here the monosyllable *march* is sung in the same time as the three syllables *Et-trick and*, and there is no difficulty in supposing that in the verse from *Exodus* the monosyllables *hár, hǽð*, were intended to occupy the same time as the trisyllables *holmegum, wederum*. We may remark too that *holmegum* is plainly equivalent to *wederum* (though the first syllable of the former is long), in accordance with the principle laid down by Möller (*Althd. Alliterationspoesie*, p. 112), that *jede Folge von zwei Silben* (∪ plus ∪, — plus ∪) *wenn nur die Nebenhebung nicht auf die zweite, sondern erst auf die folgende Silbe fällt, gleichwertig mit* ⏑ (*ist*).

The remarks just made trench upon the difficult question of *Taktgleichheit*, which is too large for the compass of this chapter. In the one following, I shall endeavour to show that the construction of those verses in *Béowulf*, which have 'crossed alliteration,' lends some strength to the view so ably maintained by Prof. Möller (and accepted by Dr. Heusler) that alliterative verse is metrical in the strictest sense of the word.

At least one example of a half-verse as condensed as *hár hǽð* occurs in *Béowulf*, but it has been obscured by an emendation which has brought ruin into the most pathetic outburst in the whole poem, viz. the wail of Hrôðgar over the death of Æschere (vv. 1323–1330). Here the original is incomparably fine, not a word is lost from the startling,

Ne frîn þû æfter **sǽlum!**

at the outset (in response to the cheery morning greeting of Béowulf), to the closing eulogy over the dead warrior:

Swylc scolde **eorl** *wesan*
ær-ɣóð, *swylc Æsc-here wæs.*

The editors have introduced *æðeling* (!) from vv. 130ª 2343ª (*æðeling ærgôd*), in which the word is quite in place, whereas in the passage above it would be the merest padding*.

* Another instance in which the strength of the original appears to me to have been grievously watered down is B. 2489ª, **hr**ǽ*s blâc* [Editors:

Another question which is affected by the existence or not of the inner cæsura, but which I must only glance at here, is that of the number of accents in a half-verse. This was the point at issue in the famous controversy between the *Vierhebungstheorie* and the *Zweihebungstheorie*, which originated in 1848, with Wackernagel (*Litteraturgeschichte*, § 25), who first controverted the view of Lachmann that the alliterative half-verse contains four accents. Lachmann, it is true, excepted O. E. verse from the rule, but Schubert (*De Anglosaxonum arte metrica*, 1870) endeavoured to bring this also under it. His argument was supposed to have been triumphantly set aside, and the *Zweihebungstheorie* finally established by Vetter in 1872 (*Zum Muspilli*, pp. 3–25); but the question has again raised its head and opinion is still unsettled with regard to it, as may be very clearly seen from a single example. The half-verse, *Béowulf*, 10ᵇ, *hŷran scolde*, which is the first given by Prof. Sievers under the A- or *Grundtypus*, possesses according to Möller (p. 128, note), and Fuhr (*Metrik des westgerm. Allit.verses*, p. 57) four accents (´ x | ´ x); according to Hirt (*Westgerm. Verskunst*, p. 81) three accents, ´ x | ´ | ˘; according to Sievers (*P. B. B.* x. 222) two accents, ´ x | ´ x, &c.; according to Hinze (*Zum Andreas*, p. 10) only one accent, ´ x x x!

Dr. Hirt (cf. p. 49) sees a proof that there is an accent on the second syllable of *scolde*, in the existence of A verses with '*zweisilbige Senkung im zweiten Fuss*,' e.g. *ôðres dôgores* (cp. *P. B. B.* x. 233), inasmuch as we must necessarily read *dŏ́-gorès*, and *dŏ́-grès* and *dŏ́-gorès* are metrically equivalent. I should see it rather in the pause at the end of the half-verse. Final syllables which have naturally no

hreás *heoro*-blâc]. Retaining the MS. reading, and breaking the half-verse with a pause of 2 *Moren* (see p. 36) at hreás, the *blâc* is brought out with a force that reminds one of Virgil's *procumbit humi bos* (Aen. v. 481); or we may compare Tennyson's *The Prince without a word from his horse fell* (Geraint and Enid, ii. 519). Cp. also *Béowulf* 653ᵃ, 3087ᵃ. The latter verse, if I interpret it rightly, is as dramatic a touch as anything in the poem, and at the same time a fine example of *reticence*.

accent easily acquire one before a pause in measured recitation, as we may notice whenever we hear the English liturgy read in our churches. So again in a Roman Catholic church, during the reading of a homily of St. Augustine's, I have heard the second syllable of *homo* pronounced in all three possible ways: with a principal accent (*hómó*) before a full stop, with a secondary (*hómò*) before a comma, and with no accent at all (*hómo*) when not followed by a pause. And this is, I believe, the immemorial practice. Prof. Möller gives practically the same explanation as my own, saying: '*Meine Accentsetzung bezieht sich überall auf den gesungenen oder im Takte recitierten Vers*' (p. 128, note).

If, then, the half-verse *hŷran scolde* was recited with two pauses—a middle and a final—as we believe, it must have been recited also with four accents, two primary and two secondary, thus: *hýràn scóldè.*

I may conclude this chapter by giving an extract from *Béowulf* with full points and accents inserted:—

Béowulf 194–216.

Þæt fram hắm · gefrægn · Hígelắces · þégn ·
195 ȝốd · mid Gẽatùm · Gréndlès · dǽdà ·
sê wæs món · cýnnès · mǽgenès · stréngèst ·
on þắm · dæȝe · þýssès · lífes ·
æðelè · ond ẽacèn · Hêt him ýð · lídan ·
ȝố-dnè · ȝeȝýrwàn · cwæð hê ȝũð · cýninȝ ·
200 ofer swán · rắdè · sẽceàn · wóldè ·
mắrnè · þẽodèn · þâ him wæs mánnà · þéarf ·
þone sĩð-fæt · hím · snóterè · céorlàs ·
lýt-hwồn · lốgòn · þêah hê him lẽof · wắrè ·
hwéttòn · hígerõfne · hắl · scẽawedòn ·
205 Hæfdè · se gốdà · Gẽatà · lẽodà ·
cémpàn · ȝecóronè · þâra þe hê cẽn-óstè ·
findàn · míhtè · fĩftèna · súm ·
súnd-wùdu · sõhtè · sécg · wĩsàde ·
lágu-cræftig · món · lánd · ȝemýrcù ·
210 Fýrst · fórð ȝewắt · flóta wæs · on ýðùm ·
bắt · under béorgè · Béornàs · géarwè ·
on stéfn · stígon · stréamàs · wúndòn ·
súnd · wið sándè · sécgàs · bắròn ·

on béarm · nácan · beórhtè · frætwè ·
215 ȝûð-seàro · ȝéatolìc · ȝúman · ût scùfon ·
wéras · on wíl-sîð · wúdu · búndènne ·

It will naturally be asked: Are the pauses here represented by dots to be all of equal duration? This again raises the question of *Taktgleichheit*, which cannot in this place be fully dealt with. Some answer must, however, be given. According to Prof. Möller (p. 110) the half-verse consists theoretically of two *Takte*, each of four *Moren*: ×́ × ×̀ × (a *More*, ×, being the time required for one short syllable); and therefore the whole verse of four *Takte*, thus:

×́ × ×̀ × | ×́ × ×̀ × ‖ ×́ × ×̀ × | ×́ × ×̀ × ‖

Where, in a verse, the *Moren* are not filled by actual syllables, their time must be occupied by rests (represented by *r*) in reciting, by holding on the note in singing. A long syllable, —, is equivalent to two *Moren*. Thus, verse 208 above would be symbolically represented as follows:

–́ ×̀ × | –́ ×̀ r ‖ –́ r r | –́ ×̀ ×.

According to this system the pause at *secg* will be twice as long as that at *sohte*, whilst at *wudu* there will be no real pause, and the point will merely indicate the end of the *Takt*. In like manner the pause at *hæfde* 205[a] is merely nominal, the time being filled up by the word in *Auftakt* (*se*) following it.

Another point of great difficulty, which I must postpone for the present, is the proper treatment of the *Auftakt*[1] when this extends beyond a single syllable, as in 194[a], 198[b], 201[b]. Hirt and Fuhr make systematic feet out of the alternation of accented and unaccented syllables which necessarily exists in such cases. But this cannot be done without disturbing the alliteration hitherto regarded as the hinge upon which the whole verse turns. Hirt however insinuates that its rôle has been over-estimated.

[1] Meaning by this term all the syllables preceding the first alliterating letter. Prof. Sievers distinguishes between *Auftakt* for A and D verses, and *Eingangssenkung* for B and C verses (cp. *P.B.B.* x. 215).

Speaking of the various ways in which verses like 205ª (Sievers A³) have been regarded, he says (p. 41):—'*Diese Gegenüberstellungen zeigen aber, dass die Alliteration bei der Bestimmung dieser Verse nicht allein massgebend ist, ja sie wagen es, uns zuzuraunen, dass sie wohl überhaupt nicht eine so bestimmende Bedeutung habe, als man bisher anzunehmen geneigt war.*'

A dangerous suggestion this, to cut the thread upon which the verse is strung, and we shall do better, I think, to consider that the accents in this introductory portion of the verse were simply ignored, and the words themselves hurried over as quickly as might be. Poets, after all, must work with the materials they have, and were we never to allow a natural accent to be neglected, what would become of our English anapæstic verse, e. g. of such a line as Browning's,

And grow óne | in the sénse | of this wórld's | life.—And thén | the last sóng |

CHAPTER II.

Crossed Alliteration in Béowulf[1].

The normal O. E. verse contains three alliterating syllables, two in the first half and one in the second, as in *Béowulf* 4:

Oft **Sc**yld **Sc**e*fin*ʒ **sc**ea*ðena þreatum.*

Often the first half-verse has only one alliterating syllable, which may be in the first arsis as in *Béowulf* 2:

þeód-cyninʒa þrym ʒefrûnon

or in the second, e. g. *Béowulf* 22:

þæt hine on **y**l*de* **e***ft* ʒ*ewuniʒen.*

These types of alliteration may be symbolically represented thus:—

(i) **a** | **a** || **a** | — (ii) **a** | — || **a** | — (iii) — | **a** || **a** | —.

The only syllable which invariably alliterates is the one in the first arsis of the 2nd half-verse, and its initial has accordingly been called the *chief-letter*, as governing the alliteration of the verse. The name is taken from the Icelandic *hǫfuðstafr*, which is the term used by the old grammarian Snorri Sturluson.

The fourth arsis of the verse is excluded from the regular alliteration. Occasional examples, however, occur of an alliterative scheme **a** | **b** || **a** | **b**, as in *Béowulf* 1:

Hwæt! we **G**ar-**D**e*na in* **g**ear-da*ʒum*

and also of a scheme **b** | **a** || **a** | **b** as in *Béowulf* 535:

Wi*t þæt* ʒ**e**c*wædon* **c**ni*ht-***w**e*sende*

[1] The edition used = the *Heyne-Socin*, 1888.

(cp. Rieger, *Verskunst*, p. 5). Rieger found some 60 (*einige sechzig*) of the former type and 18 of the latter in *Béowulf*. My own counting gives the numbers as 82 and 24 respectively. It has been supposed by most writers since Rieger that these types with crossed alliteration exist only in appearance. Thus Horn (*P.B.B.* v. 166) contended that they are entirely contrary to the nature of alliterative verse, and must therefore be quite unintentional, and Frucht (*Zu Cynewulfs Elene*, &c., p. 75) endeavoured to show that the occurrence of such coincidences between second and fourth arses as -d*ena*, -d*agum*, is less frequent in Cynewulf, at all events, than the doctrine of Probabilities would lead us to expect.

Frucht's calculation has been, so lately as this year, accepted as probably correct by Fuhr (*Metrik des westg. Alliterationsverses*, p. 25), but it involves the extraordinary fallacy of treating all possible initials (*Anlaute*) as equally likely to occur in the final arsis of a verse. Of such *Anlaute* there are 19, viz. *b*, *c*, *d*, *f*, *g*, *h*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *p*, *r*, *s*, *sc*, *sp*, *st*, *t*, *þ*, *w*, and any one of the vowels. It therefore follows, says Frucht, that the chances of such a coincidence as that in *Béowulf* 1 are one in nineteen[1]. Now there are 1406 verses in Cynewulf in which crossed alliteration is possible (that is, in which the first half-verse has only single alliteration); therefore we should expect to find $1406 \div 19$ or 74 instances of it among them. There are however only 64. Thus there are fewer examples of coincidence than we should naturally expect, apart from any design in the writer, and we must therefore infer that such as do occur are accidental. This is Frucht's argument. To my mind it would be quite inconclusive, even if it were mathematically sound. Who will suppose that the crossed alliteration is undesigned in the powerful line of *In Memoriam* (vi. 4):

His heavy-shotted hammock-shroud *?*

[1] Clearly one in *eighteen*, as one of the nineteen *Anlaute* is wanted for the chief letter.

Yet, strongly alliterative as the poem is, such an example does not, to my knowledge, occur again in it. (Though compare Canto xxi. 4, 2.)

The calculation, however, as we have said, rests on a false assumption. A very short examination is enough to make it clear that some initials (e. g. **h** and **w**) occur much oftener in the final arsis of a verse than others (e. g. than **r** and **þ**), and that, consequently, to place all the letters on the same footing, as Frucht has done, must be erroneous.

If we are to apply the doctrine of Probabilities with any safety we must take the letters one by one. Even were we to encounter this task, however, it is probable that Mathematics would refuse to give a verdict upon data so scanty and so little rigorous as we possess. It will be more to the purpose to collect the verses in which crossed alliteration occurs and see what impression they produce when read together, and if they have any peculiar characteristics marking them off as a class by themselves.

Taking first the type **a** | **b** || **a** | **b**, we have in *Béowulf* the following examples:—

i. **a**=Vowel, **b**=consonant: viz.

V : b *tô* **ecg-b***anan* **ân***gan* **bréð**er, *Béow.* 1263; also **V : c.** v. 700; **V : h** 1183; **V : l** 566, 1489; **V : m** 908; **V : r** 1202; **V : s** 2516; and **V : w** 1315; in all 9 examples with vowel-alliteration in 1st and 3rd arses, and consonant-alliteration in 2nd and 4th.

ii. (a) **b** + consonant: viz.

b : c *seó þe* **bân-c***ofan* **beorg***an* **cûð***e* 1446, also **b : h** 3148; **b : n** 343; **b : st** 1920; **b : w** 2163, 2908, 3067; in all 7 examples.

(b) **b** + vowel: v. 1969 . . . . . 1 ex.

iii. Similarly **c : h** 98; **c : w** 282, 2067 . . . . . 3 ex.

iv. **d : h** 88, 2727; **d : w** 2187 . . . . . 3 ex.

v. **f : b** 2466; **f : h** 1850; **f : m** 3163 . . . . . 3 ex.

vi. **g : d** 1, 1825; **g : f** 592; **g : h** 3075; **g : l** 830; **g : m** 2268; **g : n** 804 . . . . . 7 ex.

vii. **h : b** 654, 1444; **h : g** 64, 374; **h : l** 1144; **h : st** 32, 1133; **h : w** 39, 1938, 2999 . . . . . 10 ex.

viii. **l : h** 2031; **l : m** 209; **l : w** 972; **l : þ** 34 . . . . 4 ex.

ix. **m : c** 418, 2182; **m : g** 1302; **m : h** 731; **m : s** 2092; **m : þ** 201; **m : w** 2480 . . . . . 7 ex.

x. n : h 2398 ; n : s 1204 . . . . . 2 ex.
xi. s : f 1476 ; s : g 1343 ; s : h 920, 1017 ; s : l 3090 ; s : m 1612, 2955 ; s : w 2187, 2875 . . . . . 9 ex.
xii. sc + vowel 19 ; sc : m 1940 . . . . . 2 ex.
xiii. t : m 1141 . . . . . 1 ex.
xiv. þ : c 2971 ; þ : h 2236 ; þ : l 2638 ; þ : m 365, 1342, 2722 ; þ : n 2225 . . . . . 7 ex.
xv. w : b 2568 ; w : d 590 ; w : f 2262 ; w : g 1996 ; w : l 2746 ; w : s 1404 ; w : þ 525 . . . . . 7 ex.

In all 82 examples.

Whether the poet sought for it or no, the crossed alliteration in these verses has a sensible æsthetic value, as it also has in Tennyson's line quoted above. The 'singularly beautiful effect' of the 'double' alliteration occasionally found in Milton is pointed out in *English Lessons for English People* by Messrs. Seeley and Abbot (p. 182). Schipper quotes *Hamlet*, I. 2, 65,

A little more than **kin**, *and less than* **kind**,

as an example from Shakespeare, but erroneously, as the emphatic accent is on *more* which is in antithesis to *less*, whereas *little* being an adverb of degree is proclitic (Rieger, p. 39). The example which Seeley and Abbot give from Shakespeare is equally defective: viz.

Our **d***readful* **m***arches to* **d***elightful* **m***easures.*
Richard III, Act I. sc. i. v. 8.

as *delightful* can properly alliterate only with the **l**. Zeuner in his treatise on alliteration in modern English poems gives better examples of the scheme **a** | **b** || **a** | **b**, which he considers *entschieden beabsichtigt*.

If, therefore, we recognise design in the scattered instances where this form of alliteration appears in modern poetry it is not reasonable to think that the author (or authors) of *Béowulf*, a poem which, as Rieger well says (p. 13), appears under every aspect with the stamp of a classic, fell merely by accident into crossed alliteration in the cases cited above, or that so artistic a composer as

Cynewulf was not fully aware of its effect in the instances mentioned by Frucht.

A circumstance which strengthens this assertion is the tendency of an initial to repeat itself at the close even of successive long verses. The commonest initial in the fourth arsis is w, its appearances in this position being distributed very evenly throughout the poem. Evenly, that is to say, for large sections of 500 verses, but within these sections the occurrences are very irregular, often coming in patches of three or four, and then ceasing for intervals of 20, 30, or 40 verses. Thus the 35 verses from 247 to 281 do not once contain this ending, whilst the next eleven verses, 282 to 292, have it five times. It is entirely missing again between 1140 and 1170 and between 1600 and 1645. Often after an interval it comes in couplets, and sometimes in triplets as in vv. 1795, 1796, 1797; 1864, 1865, 1866; 2161, 2162, 2163; 2185, 2186, 2187; 2780, 2781, 2782.

We see the same inclination of the poet to harp, from time to time, on one string in the case of other letters. There is a quartette of c's in 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048; a triplet of l's (2935, 2936, 2937); of þ's (1722, 1723, 1724) and of st's (1373, 1374, 1375), the last a by no means common initial.

It must be borne in mind that such alliterative end-rhymes are not a mere ocular effect, as we might be tempted to imagine when looking at the verses in a modern edition of *Béowulf*. The 'poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling' was probably not disturbed by such mechanical details as pens and paper. However, even if they were written down at the time of composing, the verses would not be arranged in lines, if we may judge from our MSS. in which they run on just like prose.

But if this rhyming tendency could act after the interval of a whole verse, it could certainly do so when merely a half-verse had intervened.

We have now to answer the *a priori* objection of Horn,

that crossed alliteration is entirely contrary to the nature of alliterative verse.

So indeed it seems, at first sight, to be. The final arsis is ordinarily excluded from the alliteration because the expiratory force, which naturally declines towards the end of the verse, is not strong enough, without a fresh exertion, to give effect to it [1].

We may however argue that the extra alliteration, though real, is of course less emphatic than the principal, and in the second place we may enquire whether there cannot be something in the construction of the verses which have it to justify their partial deviation from the ordinary rule.

The following table supplies an answer to this question. The verses are divided into sections according to the arses. The first column of each half-verse contains the words (if any) which precede the first alliterating letter:—

	a.			b.		
	Auftakt.	*1st Arsis.*	*2nd Arsis.*	*Auftakt.*	*3rd Arsis.*	*4th Arsis.*
(a) B. 1	Hwæt! wê	Gâr-	Dena	in	geâr-	dagum
„ 972	tô	lîf-	wraðe	. . .	lâst	weardian
„ 1263	tô	ecg-	banan	. . .	angan	brêðer
„ 1343	sê þe æfter	sinc-	gyfan	on	sefan	greóteð
„ 1404	æfter	wald-	swaðum	. . .	wide	gesŷne
„ 1446	seó þe	bân-	cofan	. . .	beorgan	cûðe
„ 1996	þæt þû þone	wæl-	gâst	. . .	wihte	ne grêtte
„ 2031	æfter	leód-	hryre	. . .	lŷtle	hwîle
„ 2262	æfter	wig-	fruman	. . .	wide	fêran
„ 2466	on þâm	feorh-	bonan	. . .	fâhðe	gebêtan
„ 2480	þæt	mâg-	wine	. . .	mîne	gewrâcan
„ 2516	of	eorð-	sele	. . .	ût	gesêceð
„ 2638	gif him	þys	licu	. . .	þearf	gelumpe
„ 2971	syððan	þeód-	cyning	. . .	þyder	oncirde
„ 3075	næs hê	gold-	hwæt	. . .	gearwor	hæfde
„ 3090		swæs-	lice	. . ,	sîð	âlŷfed
„ 3148	oð þæt hê þâ	bân-	hûs	ge	brocen	hæfde
„ 374	þêm tô	hâm	forgeaf	. . .	Hrêðel	Geáta
„ 908	swylce	oft	bemearn	. . .	êrran	mâlum

[1] I owe this explanation to Prof. Möller.

	a.			b.		
	Auftakt.	*1st Arsis.*	*2nd Arsis.*	*Auftakt.*	*3rd Arsis.*	*4th Arsis.*
(a) B. 1141	ȝif hê	torn-	ȝemôt	þurh	teón	mihte
(b) ,, 64	þâ wæs	Hrôð-	gâre	. . .	here-spêd	gyfen
,, 282	ond þâ	cear-	wylmas	. . .	côlran	wurðað
,, 566	be	ŷð-	lâfe	. . .	uppe	lâȝon
,, 1144	þonne him	Hûn	Lâfinȝ	. . .	hilde	leóman
,, 1315	hwæðrehim	al-	walda	. . .	âfre	wille
,, 1444	scolde	here-	byrne	. . .	hondum	ȝebrôden
,, 2067	æfter	cear-	wælmum	. . .	côlran	weorðað
,, 2182	ac hê	man-	cynnes	. . .	mâste	cræfte
,, 2225	ac for	þreá-	nêdlan	. . .	þe(ów)	nât-hwylces
,, 2727	þæt hê	dæȝ-	hwîla	ȝe	droȝen	hæfde
,, 2908	ofer	Bió	wulfe	. . .	byre	Wihstânes
,, 2955	þæt hê	sâ-	mannum	on	sacan	mihte
,, 3067	swâ wæs	Bió	wulfe	þâ hê	biorȝes	weard
,, 343	. . .	beód	geneátas	. . .	Beówulf is	mîn nama
,, 1938	. . .	hand	gewriðene	. . .	hraðe se-oððan	wæs
,, 2163	. . .	breóst-	ȝewâdu.	. . .	Brûc ealles	well
(c) ,, 920 (cp. 1017)	. . .	swið-	hicȝende	tô	sele	þâm heán
,, 1204	. . .	nefa	Swertinȝes	. . .	nŷhstan	siðe
,, 1969	. . .	bonan	Onȝenþeóes	. . .	burȝum	in innan
,, 2236	. . .	þanc-	hycȝende	. . .	þêr	ȝehŷdde
,, 2999	. . .	hâm-	weorðunȝe	. . .	hyldo	tô wedde
(d) ,, 32	þêr æt	hŷðe	stôd	. . .	hrinȝed-	stefna
,, 34	â-	lêdon	þâ	. . .	leófne	þeóden
,, 365	þæt hie	þeóden	mîn	wið	þê	môton
,, 418	forþan hie	mæȝenes	cræft	. . .	minne	cûðon
,, 700	þurh	ânes	cræft	. . .	ealle	ofercômon
,, 1302	æfter	mâððum-	gife	. . .	mærum	Geáte
,, 1342	þæs þe	þincean	mæȝ	. . .	þeȝne	moneȝum
,, 1489	ond þû	Unferð	lêt	. . .	ealde	lâfe
,, 1940	þæt hit	sceáden-	mêl	. . .	scȳran	môste
,, 2268	swâ	giômor-	môd	. . .	giohðo	mânde
,, 88	þæt hê	dôȝora	ȝehwâm	. . .	dreám	ȝehŷrde
,, 525	þonne	wêne ic	tô þê	. . .	wyrsan	geþingea
,, 592	þæt nêfre	Grendel	swâ fela	. . .	gryra	gefremede
,, 2398	swâ hê	niða	ȝehwane	ȝe	nesen	hæfde
(e) ,, 209	. . .	laȝu-cræftiȝ	mon	. . .	land	ȝemyrcu
,, 731	. . .	maȝo-rinca	heáp	þâ his	môd	âhlôȝ
,, 804	. . .	gûð-billa	nân	. . .	grêtan	nolde

	a.			b.		
	Auftakt.	*1st Arsis.*	*2nd Arsis.*	*Auftakt.*	*3rd Arsis.*	*4th Arsis.*
(e) B. 830	. . .	Geát-mecga	leód	. . .	gilp	gelæsted
,, 3164	. . .	fore-snotre	men	. . .	findan	mihton
(f) ,, 590	. . .	werhðo	dreógan	þeáh þin	wit	duge
,, 654	. . .	Hrôðgâr	Beówulf	ond him	hæl	âbeád
,, 1183	. . .	árum	healdan	gyf þû	êr	þonne hê
,, 1612	. . .	sæla	ond mæla	þæt is	sôð	metod
,, 1825	. . .	gumena	dryhten	þonne ic	gŷt	dyde
,, 1850	. . .	folces	hyrde	ond þû þin	feorh	hafast
,, 2568	. . .	winia	bealdor	þâ se	wyrm	gebeáh
,, 2746	. . .	Wiglâf	leófa	nû se	wyrm	ligeð
(g) ,, 39	. . .	hilde-	wæpnum	ond	heaðo-	wædum
,, 98	. . .	cynna	gehwylcum	þâra þe	cwice	hwyrfað
,, 1911	. . .	bunden-	stefna	ofer	brim-	streámas
,, 2187	. . .	drihten	wereda	ge	dôn	wolde
,, 2188	. . .	swŷðe	(wên)don	þæt hê	sleac	wære
(h) ,, 201	. . .	mærne	þeóden	þâ him wæs	manna	þearf
,, 1202	. . .	Eormen	rices	geceás	écne	rædd
,, 1476	. . .	snottra	fengel	nû ic eom	siðes	fûs
,, 2092	. . .	manigra	sumne	hyt ne	mihte	swâ
,, 2876	. . .	sigora	waldend	þæt hê hyne	sylfne	gewræc
,, 19	. . .	Scyldes	eaferan	. . .	Scede-land-um	in
(i) ,, 1132	. . .	hringed-	stefnan	. . .	holm	storme weól
,, 2722	. . .	þeóden	mærne	. . .	þegn	ungemete till

We will begin the consideration of the foregoing examples with some remarks which Frucht makes upon double and single alliteration, i. e. upon the regular types (i), (ii), and (iii), viz. a | a || a | — &c., mentioned at the outset. He says (p. 76) '*Was den Gebrauch der doppelten resp. einfachen Alliteration im ersten Halbverse betrifft, so ist derselbe nicht willkürlich; . . . in längeren oder durch Nebenicten gesteigerten Verstypen erscheint die einfache Alliteration bei weitem nicht so häufig wie in den kürzeren oder leichteren Formen; sie wurde hier eben ungenügend befunden. Wollte man nun die gekreuzte Alliteration als*

eine besondere Kunstform von der einfachen scheiden, so müsste man natürlich vermuten, dass auch die gekreuzte Alliteration hauptsächlich in gewichtigeren Versen ihre Stelle hätte; aber gerade das Umgekehrte ist der Fall; wo die doppelte Alliteration sich mehrt, schwindet im allgemeinen die gekreuzte, sie steigt und fällt mit der einfachen Alliteration, sie ist eben ein Teil dieser letzteren.'

The facts here stated are correct, but the commentary upon them is misleading, and seems due to some confusion of thought. Where double alliteration is present in the first half-verse, crossed alliteration is obviously by that very circumstance excluded, and the verses with crossed alliteration must therefore be a part of those which have single alliteration in the first half-verse. The question is, do they form a separate class amongst these? Verses with double alliteration are as a rule heavier than those with single, as Frucht rightly observes. But in saying that we should therefore expect the verses with crossed alliteration, if such a thing exists, to be likewise heavier than those with single alliteration, he makes a questionable analogy. Crossed alliteration involves alliteration in the final arsis where, as we have said, the force of expiration is naturally weakest. If therefore a verse has alliteration in this place, we ought to expect that for some reason there has been less than the usual expenditure of breath in the earlier portion of it, so leaving a reserve of force of which the final arsis has taken advantage, in other words, that the verse has been lighter than the average.

In the table, the examples are arranged according to Professor Möller's *takte* (see p. 36), which brings the alliterating words out into strong relief. It will be seen that for the half-verses aa, bf, both *takte* are of the minimum weight, and that for the other sections ab, ac, &c., only one *takt* is so in each half-verse. Nowhere is this minimum *takt* absent throughout the whole verse; in one instance (B 1) it occurs all four times. So light a verse is

very rare; we have one such, however, in Cynewulf (*Juliana* 384), also with crossed alliteration, viz.:

wiđ flân þræce, nele feor þonan.

In the **a** half-verses of sections *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, there is, as far as I can find, no peculiarity, as regards lightness or anything else, to distinguish them from ordinary first half-verses with single alliteration. The case is different, however, as regards the **b** half-verses. The most striking thing about these is the preponderance of verses of the Sievers A type and the fewness of the relatively heavier verses of the D and E types. For whereas, taking the whole poem, the D and E types together are more than half as numerous in the second half-verse as the favourite A type (cp. *P.B.B.* x. pp. 262, 268, 290), here they are together little more than an eleventh part as numerous as the A verses. And not only are the heavier D and E types avoided, but the A verses themselves in these sections are either of the simplest possible form, $\acute{\times} \times \mid \acute{\times} \times$, or of the form $\acute{\times} \times \times \mid \acute{\times} \times$ with a light proclitic, most often simply *ge-*, as the second syllable of the *senkung* after the first arsis. In only one instance (B 700) have we the form $\acute{\times} \times \times \times \mid \acute{\times} \times$, and in this elision is possible. For the whole poem the relative frequency of the type $\acute{\times} \times \mid \acute{\times} \times$ to $\acute{\times} \times \times \mid \acute{\times} \times$ is 720 : 297, in the sections (*a*) . . . (*e*) it is 34 : 9.

Similarly the **a** half-verses of sections (*f*), (*g*), (*h*), and (*i*) are almost without exception of the simplest A type.

These considerations may serve to show that the crossed alliteration of the type **a** | **b** || **a** | **b** in *Béowulf* is not a merely haphazard thing, but that its occurrence is subject to certain rules of rhythm which the poet, consciously or not, has obeyed.

Whether the scheme **b** | **a** || **a** | **b**, also mentioned by Rieger (*Verskunst*, p. 5), has any real existence is a more difficult and at the same time a less important question.

Less important, because in any case the effect of such a secondary alliteration can only be slight, inasmuch as it takes place, if at all, between the weakest and most widely separated arses in the verse; and more difficult, for its occurrences are much less frequent and more open to question. In some cases, nevertheless, the rime seems fairly strong, e. g. in—

B. 1223 **e***alne* **w***îde-ferhð* **w***eras* **e***htiȝað*
„ 1934 **n***ênih* *þæt* **d***orste* **d***eor* **ȝ***enêðan,*

and especially in—

B. 2616 **b***rûn-fâȝne* **h***elm* **h***rinȝde* **b***yrnan.*

The last verse should, however, probably be read

b*rûn-fâȝne* **h***elm* **b***yrnan* **h***rinȝde* (Rieger, p. 21.)

[since *brûn-fâgne* cannot stand where it does without alliterating with the chief letter—Rieger, p. 19], and this gives us a verse of the **a** | **b** || **a** | **b** type. Similarly B 780[b] should be **ê***nig manna*, which would give us another example of the same type. The following are all the apparent examples of the second form of crossed alliteration which I have noticed in *Béowulf*:—

	a.	**b.**	Type of each Half-verse (Sievers).	
v. 355	*þê mê se* **g***ôda*	*âgifan* **þ***enceð*	(a) A^3	(b) C
„ 535	**w***it þæt* **g***ecwêdon*	**c***niht* **w***esende*	„ A^3	„ D
„ 780(?)	*þæt hit* **â** *mid* **g***emete*	**m***anna* **ê***nig*	„ B	„ A
„ 1185	**w***êne ic, þæt hê mid* **g***ôde*	**g***yldan* **w***ille*	„ A^3	„ A
„ 1223	**e***alne* **w***îde-ferhð*	**w***eras* **e***htigað*	„ D gestr.	„ D
„ 1483	**s***wylce þû þâ* **m***âdmas*	*þê þû* **m***ê* **s***ealdest*	„ A^3	„ C
„ 1574	**h***wearf þâ be* **w***ealle*	**w***êþen* **h***afenade*	„ A^3	„ D gestr.
„ 1722	*þæt hê þæs* **g***ewinnes*	**w***eorc* **þ***rôwade*	„ A^3	„ D
„ 1729	**h***wîlum hê on* **l***ufan*	**l***êteð* **h***worfan*	„ A^3	„ A
„ 1733	*ge*d*êð him swâ* **g***ewealdene*	**w***orolde* **d***êlas*	„ A^3	„ A
„ 1827	**g***if ic þæt* **g***efricge*	*ofer* **fl***ôda* **b***egang*	„ A^3	„ B
„ 1934	**n***ênig þæt* **d***orste*	**d***eór* **g***enêðan*	„ A^3	„ A
„ 2021	**h***wîlum for* **d***uguðe*	**d***ohtor* **H***rôðgâres*	„ A^3	„ D gestr.
„ 2159(?)	**c***wæð þæt hyt* **h***æfde*	**H***iorogâr* **c***yning*	„ A^3 (?)	„ A
„ 2338	**h***eht him þâ* **g***ewyrcean*	**w***îgendra* **h***leó*	„ A^3	„ E
„ 2378	**h***wæðre hê hine on* **f***olce*	*freónd-lârum* **h***êold*	„ A^3	„ E
„ 2386	**h***ê þêr for* **f***eorme*	*feorh-wunde* **h***leât*	„ A^3	„ E

v. 2407	sê *wæs on þâm* þreáte	*preotteódda* secg	a. A^3 b. E
„ 2616(?)	brûn-*fâgne* helm	hringde byrnan	„ E „ A
„ 2708	*ond* hî *hyne þâ* begen	âbroten hæfdon	„ A^3 „ C
„ 2974	ac *hê him on* heáfde	helm êðr gescer	„ A^3 „ D
„ 3082	þæt *hê ne* grêtte	gold-weard þone	„ A^3 „ A
„ 3166	eall *swylce* hyrsta	*swylc on* horde êðr	„ A^3 „ B
„ 3182	cwêdon *þæt hê* wêre	woruld-cyninga	„ A^3 „ D

Twenty-four in all. I have omitted one of those cited by Rieger, viz, *Béowulf* 2983,

þâ wæron monize *þe his* mæg wriðon,

as I prefer, with Sievers (*P. B. B.* x. 285), to accent *þâ wæron* mónize, &c. On similar grounds some of the examples in the above list would, no doubt, be omitted by others.

Modern English verse furnishes some examples of the b | a || a | b scheme, which Schipper (*Englische Metrik*, II. 1, 74), following Zeuner, calls '*Umschliessende Alliteration*,' a term for which it is difficult to find a good English equivalent; Seeley and Abbott (p. 182) call it a kind of verbal proportion. Instances quoted by the latter are:

The hallow'd *taper trembling in thy* hand. (Pope.)
One laced *the* helm, *another* held *the* lance. (Dryden.)

But such alliteration is rare and, as in the cases just given, of small value. Zeuner, who considers the *Reimstellung* abab in modern English poetry certainly designed (*entschieden beabsichtigt*), is doubtful as to the arrangement baab which he says is *kaum beabsichtigt* (pp. 34, 35). Horn (*P.B.B.* v. 167) remarks that the objections to the scheme a | b || a | b hold *a fortiori* with regard to b | a || a | b; nor is it possible to reconcile the latter with the nature of alliterative verse by the argument used in the case of the former, as the first half-verses of the verses with the arrangement b | a || a | b, instead of being lighter, are considerably heavier than the average. Cp.

B. 1733 ȝeðéð *him swâ* ȝewealdene worolde dælas
„ 1185 wêne *ic, þæt hê mid* gôde gyldan wille

whilst no less than eleven of the second half-verses belong to the D, E types.

Before passing away from this subject I will mention that in some verses there is apparent alliteration between a syllable with secondary accent in the first half-verse, and the final arsis of the second, e.g. *Béowulf* 939:

(a) *leóda land-ȝeweorc lâðum beweredon*

or between arsis in the first half-verse, and secondary accent in the second, e.g. *Béowulf* 1495:

(b) *bîdan wolde brim-wylm onfénȝ,*

or between secondary accents in both half-verses, *Béowulf* 2511:

(c) *Beówulf maðelode beót-wordum spræc.*

and once between secondary accent in first half-verse and chief-letter, viz. *Béowulf* 445:

(d) *mægen Hrêðmanna nâ pû mînne þearft.*

Like *a* are verses 33, 49, 65, 208, 288, 305, 350, 490, 505, 756, 1162, 1164, 1201, 1244, 1312, 1320, 1401, 1421, 1455, 1461, 1595, 1651, 1703, 1706, 1800, 1853, 1938, 2109, 2121, 2148, 2162, 2171, 2232, 2286, 2301, 2536, 2589, 2591, 2732, 2820, 2988, 3085, 3106, 3150, 3167; like *b*, 1067, 1484, 1495, 2101, 2171, 2283, 2483, 2591, 2959; like *c*, 131, 236, 988, 1066, 2594, 2966.

Whether such rimes were designed or not by the poet, and emphasized or not in the delivery, it is impossible that they should have been without some effect. They must have been heard by ears far quicker and more trained than ours to catch alliteration, as a kind of under-current in the melody of the verse.

Close examination would, I am convinced, reveal a far greater wealth of alliteration and assonance in the verse of *Béowulf* than we notice in casual reading. It is upon these two elements, as Mr. R. L. Stevenson (*Contemporary Review*, April 1885) so eloquently teaches us, that the

beauty of the contents of a phrase, or of a sentence, implicitly depends. '*The vowel demands to be repeated; the consonant demands to be repeated; and both cry aloud to be perpetually varied. You may follow the adventures of a letter through any passage that has particularly pleased you; find it perhaps denied awhile, to tantalize the ear; find it fired against you in a whole broadside* (cp. what was said about *w* in final arsis) *or find it pass into congenerous sounds, one liquid or labial melting away into another.*' Mr. Stevenson gives an exceptionally fine example of this from our greatest poet, 'exceptional in Shakespeare—exceptional indeed in literature:'

> *The* barge *she sat in like a* burnished *throne*
> Burnt *on the water: the* poop *was* beaten *gold*
> Purple *the sails and so* purfumèd *that*
> *The winds were lovesick with them.*

After these splendid chords anything from our old epic must sound a little flat, but I will venture to place alongside of this passage *Béowulf* 320–324. In order to give greater prominence to the subordinate alliteration, the principal alliteration is here not marked.

> *Strêt wæs stân-fâh stiȝ wîsode*
> ȝumum œtȝædere. *Gûð-byrne* scân
> *heard hond-locen, hrinȝ-iren* scîr
> *sonȝ in searwum, þâ hîe tô sele furðum*
> *in hyra* ȝryre-ȝeatwum ȝangan *cwômon.*

In these verses the chiming of liquids and nasals is even more distinct than in the passage from Shakespeare, as are also the vowel assonances, and though the whole effect is no doubt less harmonious, yet for the purpose in hand, the representation of warriors marching in their armour, nothing could be better calculated. The balanced swing of the metre also aids, so that we are reminded, in Mr. Skeat's words, of the 'regular tramp of an army on the march' (*Essay on All. Poetry*, p. 35).

Nevertheless, it was apropos of this very passage that Mr.

Wadham remarked, certainly with more wit than discretion, 'Surely the Anglo-Saxon lyre must have been a gridiron or some instrument not more tunable.' (*English Versification*, p. 11. Longmans, 1869.)

Finally, there is one case in which we may without doubt regard the repetition of an initial as purely casual, and needing to be as much as possible slurred over in delivery: viz. where it occurs before the chief letter, as in *Béowulf* 388.

ȝesaȝa him eac wordum þæt hie sint wil-cuman

Here if any accent were given to *sint* we should produce a kind of crossed alliteration of a type b | a || b | a, with the minor alliteration in the first place, which would produce an intolerable confusion in the minds of an audience.

This seems to be an insurmountable difficulty in the way of those metricians who introduce accented syllables before the ones which alliterate. Fuhr (p. 138) accents *Béowulf* 1497 thus:

ǽr hê þòne ȝrúndwònȝ ònȝýtan mehtè.

With accents so laid listeners would catch a quasi-alliteration between *ǽr* and *òn* before the chief alliteration was heard, which would make a serious discord in the verse.

In like manner when Hirt (p. 112), accents *Béowulf* 29:

swæsè ȝesíðàs swà hê sélfa bàd

what is to prevent a listener from supposing that in *swà* he has already heard the chief letter? To say that the accent upon the word is only a minor one is no answer, for it would be crediting an audience with hearing of preternatural acuteness to suppose that they could in a moment detect the fact when the alliteration was present to mislead them. So again in *Béowulf* 19:

lánȝe hwílê hìm þæs líf-frèâ,

the sub-alliteration coming where it does must inevitably disturb the chief.

As regards the *Auftakt*, therefore, the investigation in this chapter tends to confirm the ordinary view that it is in theory without accent. It must be admitted, however, that such a half-verse as *Béowulf* 744[a]:

s*ýn*-sn*ĉ*dum s*wéalh*

seems to show that the apparent participation of a syllable on which a merely secondary accent falls in the alliteration may be ignored.

CHAPTER III.

Vowel Alliteration in the Fourteenth Century compared with that of Béowulf.

The following investigation was suggested by Vietor's remark (*Elemente der Phonetik*, § 30, Anm. 2) that, whereas in modern English the *spiritus lenis* is not heard before an initial vowel, we may suppose, from the evidence of vowel alliteration, that Anglo-Saxon possessed it.

It struck me, in this case, as not unlikely that the sound was lost in the confusion of language which followed the Norman Conquest, inasmuch as being one of comparative difficulty, and unprotected by any orthographic sign, it would not easily hold its ground during a lengthened period in which there was no standard of speech and no contemporary literature.

If my conjecture were correct, it seemed probable that the vowel alliteration of the fourteenth century, when the genius of the old poetry woke again to life with astonishing freshness after his long sleep, would show some trace of the change which had come over the initial vowel. On my looking into *Piers Plowman* this appeared to be the case. I found it hard to discover any vowel alliteration at all; and, after looking through the whole Vision of 2400 verses (Clar. Press Ed.), had collected only about thirty examples, and in these there seemed to me a tendency to alliterate with the same vowel all through a verse (cp. *Piers Plowman*, vii. 132:

'Abstinence þe Abbesse,' quod pieres, 'myne A b c me tauȝte'),

a thing diametrically opposed to the ancient rule of Snorri Sturluson (cp. Rieger, p. 14), observed also by the Old English poets.

But I was disconcerted to find that Mr. Skeat had no word in support of my idea, either in the Introduction to *Piers Plowman* (Clar. Press, p. xxxvii), or in his *Essay on Alliterative Poetry* (see *Bishop Percy's Folio MS.* vol. iii. Introduction), or in his chapter on Metre, prefixed to the E. E. T. S. edition of the *Morte Arthure*. In all three places we read that if the chief letter be a vowel, 'it is sufficient that the sub-letters be also vowels; they need not be the same, and in practice are generally different.' So far as respected the quality of vowel alliteration in the fourteenth century: as to its quantity nothing was said. The joint-editor of the *Destruction of Troy*, however, Mr. Donaldson (vol. ii. p. 508, note), incidentally notices the rarity of vowel alliteration in *Piers Plowman* and *William of Palerne* as contrasted with its comparative frequency in the *Destruction of Troy* and in the *Morte Arthure*. Moreover, Rosenthal in his article '*Die allit. Langzeile im XIV. Jhdt.*' (*Anglia*, i. 439) seems to imply that the existence of vowel alliteration in the fourteenth century requires proof, as he brings forward instances to establish it, though by whom doubt has been thrown upon it I am not aware.

As regards the frequency of vowel alliteration, therefore, there can be no doubt that the poetry of the fourteenth century differs *toto cœlo* from the *Béowulf*, for whilst in the latter it occurs in 15 per cent. of the verses, and meets the reader at every moment, in *Piers Plowman*, one must have a vigilant eye to find it at all, putting aside the cases in which *h* enters (which it does very often twice in a verse), that is those in which there is, according to the usual description, alliteration between the *spiritus lenis* and *spiritus asper*. Even the *Morte Arthure*, by far the richest of the fourteenth century poems in vowel alliteration, contains it less often by half than *Béowulf*.

For some reason the later poets seem to have been reluctant to alliterate with the vowel, perhaps considering,

like the writer on Alliteration in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Mr. E. S. Dallas), that 'alliteration is never effective unless it runs upon consonants.'

If so, the effect of a verse with vowel alliteration in the later period must have differed radically from that produced by the same thing earlier on. Certainly a metrical resource which was a favourite with the *Béowulf* poet, must have been good enough for so careless a versifier as Langland, for, as Mr. Skeat says, 'William was not very particular about his metre.' (Cp. too Luick, '*Die englische Stabreimzeile*,' *Anglia*, xi. p. 430.)

The subjoined examples will, I hope, throw some light upon the nature of the difference. They are taken from the following poems:—

1. The *Béowulf*.

2. The *Morte Arthure*, held to have been the work of Huchowne, a Scotch poet of the fourteenth century, by Sir F. Madden (cp. his edition of *Syr Gawayne*), Panton and Donaldson (Introduction to *Destruction of Troy*, vol. ii. pp. xxxiii and lxiii), and Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. p. 139); on the other hand, considered by Mr. Morris (Preface to *Alliterative Poems*, E. E. T. S. 1864, p. vi) to have been 'composed in one of the Northumbrian dialects spoken south of the Tweed.' The MS. of the poem dates from the middle of the fifteenth century, and was written by Robert Thornton of Oswaldkirk, Yorkshire. Mr. Morris says it is 'not the original copy, nor even a literal transcript of it. It exhibits certain orthographical and grammatical peculiarities introduced by a Midland transcriber.' Panton (Preface to *Destruction of Troy*, E. E. T. S. 1874, p. xvii) contends that mere spelling is a very unsafe criterion; read aloud *more Scottico* it becomes plain that the language of the poem is truly Scottish or Northern. Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. 139 ff. 1878) seeks to prove from metrical peculiarities that the *Morte Arthure* is Scotch: Luick ('*Die englische Stabreimzeile im XIV. &c. Jhdt.*' *Anglia*, xi. p. 586)

considers Trautmann's arguments not fully conclusive (*'nicht völlig beweisend'*). Morris and Skeat (*Specimens of Early English*, Pt. II. p. xxxix) give 1360 as the date of composition of the poem: Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. p. 148) assents; Hugh of Eglintoun (Huchowne) having died about 1380.

3. *The Destruction of Troy* (E. E. T. S. 39, 56, published 1869, 1874), considered by the editors Panton and Donaldson to be a work of Huchowne's earlier than the *Morte Arthure* (Preface to Vol. ii. pp. xxxiii and lxiii): as also by Brandes (*Englische Studien*, viii. p. 410): allowed to be of Scotch origin, but not Huchowne's by Bock (*Zur Destruction of Troy*, Diss. Halle, p. 58); denied to be Huchowne's by Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. 126), who gives no opinion as to whether or not the dialect is Scotch. Donaldson (vol. ii. p. lv) says that the MS. is of 'about the middle of the fifteenth century,' and that the scribe, 'evidently a West Midland man, adapted the work to his own dialect.'

4. *William of Palerne* (E. E. T. S. Extra Series, No. 1), translated from the French by a certain 'William' about 1350. Dialect, Midland, possibly Shropshire (Morris and Skeat: *Spec.* ii. 138, Clar. Press).

5. *The Gestes of Alisaunder*, printed along with 4, supposed to be of the same authorship, by Sir F. Madden and Mr. Skeat; of different authorship, by Rosenthal (*Anglia*, i. 439).

6. *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* (E. E. T. S. No. 4), by Huchowne, according to Sir F. Madden; *not* by Huchowne, according to Trautmann—(*Anglia*, i. p. 123). Composed about 1360 (Morris and Skeat, *Spec. Early Eng.* ii. 39); between 1370 and 1380 (Trautmann, *Ueber Verfasser . . . einiger allit. Gedichte.* Hab.-schrift, Leipzig, 1876, p. 33). Written in the 'West Midland speech' (Morris E. E. T. S. No. 1. Pref. ix).

7. *Cleanness* and *Patience* (E. E. T. S. No. 1) unanimously assigned to same author as 6.

8. The *Vision of Piers the Plowman* (E. E. T. S. Nos. 28, 38, 54), by William Langland: arranged in three texts, A., B. and C., by Mr. Skeat, assigned respectively to the years 1362, 1377, and 1399. Dialect of A. Southern, with Midland peculiarities (Clar. Press, *Specimens*, II. p. 175), of B. and C. 'mixed, but on the whole that of Langland himself' (Skeat, E. E. T. S. 54, Pref. lxxi, lxxiv). A very convenient parallel edition of all three texts (not at my disposal till my lists had been made out) has been given by Mr. Skeat (Clar. Press, 1886).

---

1. Vowel Alliteration in Béowulf.

The examples have been taken from the *Heyne-Socin* edition (Paderborn and Münster, 1888). They are arranged in alphabetical order, thus: a . a : a; a . a : æ; &c. Short vowels precede long, and simple vowels diphthongs. Examples with alliteration in all the first three arses of the verse are given first, then follow examples of verses with only two alliterative letters. Single alliteration in the first arsis is expressed thus: a . – : a, in the second, thus: – . a : a.

ă.

a . â : â 733.
a . â : o 165.
a . ǽ : e 1333.
a . ǽ : ea 593, 817.
a . e : â 785.
a . e : eó 597.
a . ea : e 56.
a . eá : æ 392.
a . eo : ǽ 1677.
a . eo : e 2696.
a . i : ô 2671.
a . o : y 1566.
a . o : ŷ 1003.
a . ô : ǽ 1372.
a . û : y 1662.
a . y : eá 1767.
a . ŷ : ea 849.
a . ŷ : eo 2835.
a . – : a 929.
a . – : â 1273.
a . – : æ 354.
a . – : ǽ 510. 719, 1315, 1503, 1588.
a . – : e 823, 1525.
a . – : ea 681, 1797.
a . – : eá 1936.
a . – : eo 303, 669.
a . – : u 1309.
a . – : û 346.
– . a : æ 960.

â.

â . a : a 956.
â . â : ea 2462.
â . æ : i 1108.
â . e : e 2877.
â . e : i 1169.
â . e : ea 1764.
â . ê : æ̂ 3076.
â . ea : ea 1548.
â . ea : u 2269.
â . eo : i 2065.
â . eo : u 3139.
â . i : æ 2716.
â . i : ea 1849.
â . o : e 2784.
â . u : ea 2740.
â . y : i 1737.
â . – : a 1884.
â . – : â 425, 3011.
â . – : æ 1270.
â . – : æ 1100, 1183, 2906.
â . – : e 135, 296, 894, 1763, 2521, 2593.
â . – : ea 283, 375, 700, 1459, 2542.
â . – : eo 2535.
â . – : eó 317, 635.
â . – : o 256, 556, 2840.
â . – : ô 219.
â . – : û 382, 458.
â . – : y 740.
– . â : æ̂ 2607.
– . â : eo 431.

æ.

æ . â : ea 2668.
æ . æ̂ : e 2343.
æ . æ̂ : u 130.
æ . e : e 2507.
æ . eá : a 1226.
æ . ea : u 1501.
æ . eá : ŷ 198.
æ . eo : u 2008.
æ . o : e 263.
æ . u : e 2189.
æ . u : i 330.
æ . u : ea 2444.
æ . – : â 889.
æ . – : æ̂ 2375.
æ . – : e 3, 1597, 1805.
æ . – : ê 159, 2166, 2372.
æ . – : ea 3172.
æ . – : eo 92, 983.
æ . – : i 2227.
æ . – : o 1950.
æ . – : y 2598.
æ . – : ŷ 1245.

æ̂.

æ̂ . a : eó 251.
æ̂ . æ : û 3107.
æ̂ . e : i 1618.
æ̂ . eá : ê 617.
æ̂ . eo : î 803.
æ̂ . eo : ô 1229.
æ̂ . o : a 2499.
æ̂ . o : y 1887.
æ̂ . ô : u 1166.
æ̂ . u : æ 3136.
æ̂ . u : ea 1866, 2625.
æ̂ . û : î 2082.
æ̂ . y : ea 77.
æ̂ . ŷ : u 46.
æ̂ . – : a 15.
æ̂ . – : â 647, 2238.
æ̂ . – : æ 1330, 2732.
æ̂ . – : æ̂ 656, 1357.
æ̂ . – : eo 1051, 3016.
æ̂ . – : e 2158, 2845, 3036.
æ̂ . – : o 2501, 3126.
æ̂ . – : u 760.
æ̂ . – : y 9.
– . æ̂ : eo 628.

e.

e . a : â 2315.
e . â : e 1530.
e . â : ea 1378.
e . â : u 449, 1411.
e . æ̂ : æ̂ 1680.
e . æ : e 1788.
e . æ̂ : i 643.
e . ea : æ̂ 693, 2655.
e . eo : æ̂ 6, 1892.
e . eo : ea 2826.
e . eo : eo 1968.
e . eo : i 1282, 1650.
e . eo : o 2918.
e . eó : â 2677.
e . eó : ea 1739.

e . î : â 1460.
e . î : ea 2779.
e . io : u 2201.
e . u : â 1098.
e . u : æ̂ 988, 2565, (3170).
e . u : i 2215.
e . u : o 444, 2272.

e . – : a 340, 662, 806, 1288, 1542.
e . – : â 84, 108, 901, 1263, 2400, 2644.
e . – : æ 280, 1465, 2123.
e . – : æ̂ 241, 2591, 2788.

e . – : e 1754, 2112. 2897.
e . – : ea 86, 854, 2737.
e . – : eá 829.
e . – : o 2388.
e . – : ô 1350, 1472.
e . – : u 877.
– . e : eá 2611.

ê.

ê . â : eo 1513.
ê . â : y 2379.
ê . æ̂ : e 2862.
ê . e : a 1494.
ê . eá : ea 1195.
ê . eo : i 2720.

ê . ŷ : ea 2150.
ê . – : a 1780.
ê . – : e 1693.
ê . – : ea 577, 914.
ê . – : eo 2894.
ê . – : eó 1961.

ê . – : o 1761, 2797.
ê . – : ô 3102.
ê . – : u 410.
– . ê : e 1775.
– . ê : eo 1731.

ea.

ea . a : â 1001.
ea . â : e 2369.
ea . æ : a 907.
ea . æ : ea 2043.
ea . æ̂ : û 2075.
ea . e : â 1711, 2775.
ea . e : æ̂ 2350.
ea . e : e 2791.
ea . e : eo 903.
ea . e : o 2930.
ea . e : ô 2452.
ea . e : u 603.
ea . e : û 2814.
ea . ê : â 2211.
ea . ê : eo 1703.
ea . ê : eó 2886.
ea . ê : ô 2199.
ea . ea : æ̂ 973.
ea . ea : ea 836.
ea . eá : o 1664.

ea . eo : æ̂ 2958.
ea . eo : e 1559, 2980, 3175.
ea . eo : ea 1728.
ea . eo : o 2617.
ea . i : æ̂ 2450.
ea . i : eo 1156.
ea . i : î 999.
ea . i : o 2479.
ea . i : ô 1875.
ea . ô : ea 2764.
ea . u : eo 357.
ea . u : o 2761.
ea . u : û 961.
ea . û : æ̂ 2298.
ea . ŷ : æ̂ 534.
ea . – : â 472, 1715, 2600, 2658, 2921.

ea . – : æ 12, 1658.
ea . – : æ̂ 758, 1382, 1467, 2304, 3004, 3027.
ea . – : e 373, 808.
ea . – : ê 946, 2331.
ea . – : ea 870, 1718.
ea . – : eá 1782, 2471.
ea . – : eo 884, 2339, 2823.
ea . – : i 1777.
ea . – : î 1609.
ea . – : o 1327, 2868, 2939, 2973.
ea . – : ô 481, 1030, 1339, 1689, 1946, 2062.
ea . – : ? 2230.
– . – : ? 2362.

eá.

eá . â : æ̂ 433.
eá . e : u 276, 2141.

eá . ea : e 1622.
eá . û : eo 2335.

eá . – : â 100, 882.
eá . – : e 138.

eo.

eo . a : y 690.
eo . æ : a 369.
eo . æ̂ : æ̂ 2249.
eo . æ̂ : e 1758.
eo . e : æ 2817.
eo . e : æ̂ 2623.
eo . e : e 638, 2536, 3064.
eo . e : ea 358, 2022, 2134.
eo . e : o 3008.
eo . e : u 224.
eo . ea : i 3124.
eo . ea : y 770.
eo . eo : eó 248.

eo . i : a 1448.
eo . i : o 1045.
eo . î : æ 1113.
eo . o : u 2952.
eo . ô : u 2909.
eo . û : eo 762.
eo . y : o 112.
eo . – : á 428, 1089, 2411.
eo . – : æ 2235.
eo . – : æ̂ 792, 1236, 2233, 2713.
eo . – : e 753, 2143, 2892, 3047.

eo . – : ê 1202.
eo . – : ea 796, 1036, 1443, 2728.
eo . – : eo 1329, 3168.
eo . – : i 1142, 1867, 2191.
eo . – : o 1958.
eo . – : ô 860.
eo . – : u 1073.
eo . – : û 664.
eo . – : ŷ 1209.
– . eo : e 1146.
– . eo : ô 1823.
– . eo : û 2856.

eó.

eó . eo : æ 1313.
eó . u : ea 3032.

eó . y : eá 727.
eó . – : æ 1409.

eó . – : i 621.

i.

i . â : y 1260.
i . e : æ̂ 1942.
i . eo : â 1038.
i . eo : o 3091.
i . i : ea 3088.
i . o : eá 1352.
i . u : æ 413.
i . û : æ 33.

i . û : î 775.
i . – : æ̂ 832, 1102, 1859, 1948.
i . – : e 2578.
i . – : ea 750, 1645, 2153.
i . – : eo 2245.

i . – : ô 2168.
– · i : a 2116;
– . i : æ 118.
– . i : ea 71.
– . i : u 2090.
io . – : â 2998.
io . – : o 2994.

î.

î . æ̂ : â 990.
î . æ̂ : ê 2587.
– : æ 2889.

î . – : æ̂ 1698.
î . – : e 2684, 2829.

î . – : o 674.
î . – : ô 1134.

o.

o . á : û 2558.
o . ǽ : á 1886.
o . ǽ : e 2773, 3020.
o . e : i 1550.
o . eo : á 3078.
o . eo : æ 1421.
o . i : o 1741.
o . u : ǽ 287.

o . – : a 1248.
o . – : á 2927.
o . – : ǽ { 908, 1580, 2748, 3128.
o . – : e 2962.
o . – : ea { 831, 2088, 2428, 2476, 2925.

o . – : eo 2487.
o . – : î { 672, 2987, 3117.
o . – : ô 2408, 2933.
o . – : u (2003), 2912.
o . – : û 3131.
o . – : ŷ 1919.

ô.

ô . e : eo 3050.
ô , î : ǽ 1301.

ô . y : e 2118.
ô . – : æ 332.

ô . – : ea 1087, 2482.
ô . – : û 1584.

u.

u . æ : e 1255.
u . ǽ : á 1188.
u . eo : e 573.
u . ea : ea 1186.
u . eo : æ 1239.
u . – : æ 1390, 1921.

u . – : ǽ 933, 2549.
u . – : e 499, 1735.
u . – : ea { 111, 745, 1489, 1656.
u . – : eá 2292, 2393.

u . – : eó 2533.
u . – : i 3060.
u . – : o 1429.
–. u : ǽ 126.
–. u : ea 1130.

û.

û . ǽ : e 1387.

–. û : ǽ 503.

y.

y . á : e 1576.
y . ô : eo 1533.
y . – : a 258.
y . – : á 2454.
y . – : ǽ { 70, 1054, 2735.

y . – : e 1828.
y . – : o 2095.
y . – : ô 363, 606.
y . – : u { 150, 468, 2436.

y . – : y 1325.
y . – : ŷ (1904).
–. y : e 22.
–. y : eá 3052.
–. y : u 2093.

ŷ.

ŷ . eo : ŷ 421.
ŷ . – : a 1435, 1470.
ŷ . – : á 464.

ŷ . – : e 1557.
ŷ . – : ea 1594, 1621.
ŷ . – : eá 228.

ŷ . – : i 2413.
ŷ . – : u 566, 1374.
–. ŷ : eo 1438.

Altogether, there are, according to my examination, 493 examples of vowel alliteration in *Béowulf*, making a percentage of 15·48 of the 3184 verses in the poem.

Vowel Alliteration in the Fourteenth Century.

The examples which follow are taken from the entire poems, except in the case of the *Destruction of Troy*, in which the first 2000 verses of each volume have been examined, as well as 2000 verses after ver. 5559 (describing the arrival of the Greeks at Troy, and the battles of the first few days), a few isolated instances having been added from other parts. The tables include both pure and mixed (i.e. combined with *h*-) vowel alliteration. They are drawn up in alphabetic order, the simple vowel coming first, then the aspirated, and thirdly the diphthongs based upon the simple vowel: thus (1) **a. a : a**, (2) **a. a : ha**, (3) **a. a : ai** (&c.), and so again **a. ha : a**, &c., **a. ai : a**, &c., and **ha. a : a**, &c., **ai. a : a**, &c.

Remarks on points of interest or difficulty follow each table, in the course of which references are made to the following writers:

Luick: '*Die englische Stabreimzeile im XIV. &c. Jahrht.*' *Anglia*, xi. 392 & 553.

Rieger: '*Alts. und Ags. Verskunst.*' (Sonderabdruck aus der *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Phil.* Bd. vii).

Schipper: *Englische Metrik.*

Sievers: *Paul u. Braune, Beiträge*, x.

Sweet: *Hist. of Engl. Sounds.*

Trautmann: '*Ueber Huchowne*,' *Anglia*, i.

MORTE ARTHURE.

a.

a . a	: a	273, 496, 508, 986, 1009, 1938, 2627.	a . a	: au	306.
a . a	: ha	1662.	a . a	: e	1148, 1691, 1694, 2426, 3356, 3652, 3966, 4264.

a	. a	: ew	574.
a	. a	: o	98, 902, 2565.
a	. a	: ho	2337.
a	. ha	: a	1674.
a	. ha	: ho	3918.
a	. au	: a	288.
a	. au	: e	4161.
a	. au	: ow	2608.
a	. au	: u	521.
a	. aw	: u	4217.
a	. ay	: e	1591, 2607, 2635.
a	. ay	: o	1944, 1991.
a	. e	: a	1327, 1593, 2839.
a	. e	: au	276, 414.
a	. e	: e	519, 576, 2636.
a	. e	: i	1592.
a	. e	: o	45.
a	. e	: ho	3077.
a	. e	: ow	1952.
a	. he	: ho	1309.
a	. i	: a	3501.
a	. i	: au	1510.
a	. i	: e	3686.
a	. o	: a	193, 572, 2830, 4069.
a	. o	: au	2386.
a	. o	: ay	2290.
a	. o	: e	4114.
a	. o	: o	1145, 2360.
a	. o	: ho	2289.
a	. o	: u	3450.
a	. ou	: o	2803.
au	. a	: a	1016.
au	. a	: e	360.
au	. au	: u	1310.
au	. o	: a	289.
au	. o	: o	661, 2256.
au	. ho	: ou	2868.
aw	. a	: ay	455.
aw	. a	: e	4070.
aw	. a	: jo	1905.
aw	: a	: ow	2618.
aw	. e	: hy	2564.
aw	. u	: e	2247.
ay	. a	: awu	3189.
ay	. a	: e	3597.
ay	. a	: o	617.
ay	. ay	: he	2831.
ay	. e	: a	3802.
ay	. e	: e	1740, 2200.
ay	. i	: ow	3910.
ay	: o	: aw	279.
ay	. hu	: hye	620.
ay	: y	: e	283.
a	. –	: a	1824, 3717.
a	. –	: ha	1878.
a	. –	: e	358, 1659, 3782.
au	. –	: u	462.
aw	. –	: a	2718.
aw	. –	: o	1624, 1907.
–	. a	: a	765, 910.
–	. a	: aw	1596.
–	. a	: o	305.
–	. a	: ho	2008.
–	. a	: u	2848.
–	. aw	: a	2543.
e	. –	: a	894, 900.
ay	. a	: s	4080.

e.

e	. a	: a	618, 1661, 2838.
e	. a	: au	4343.
e	. a	: aw	13, 1326.
e	. a	: e	42, 286, 1125, 1499, 3211, 3409, 3934.
e	. a	: he	3147.
e	. a	: i	4124.
e	. a	: o	1869, 2288, 2387, 4265.
e	. a	: we	3449.
e	. aw	: aw	1967.
e	. e	: a	2222, 2245, 2246, 2255.

e . e : ha 3502.
e . e : e { 507, 554, 1006, 1347, 4162.
e . e : o 67, 307, 4076.
e . e : ho 2291.
e . he : e 1558.
e . he : hu 2974.
e . i : a 1412, 1957, 2529.
e . i : e 4152.
e . i : hy 1122.
e . o : a 2027, 2717, 4301.
e . o : au 1623, 1906.
e . o : aw 2840.
e . o : e { 520, 577, 1294, 2339, 4163.
e . o : i 4164.
e . o : ow 3590, 3781.
e . o : ho 2006.
e . o : u (? 30) 3482.
e . ho : a 1087, 2338.
e . ho : e 565, 1293.
e . ho : u 3246.
e . u : e 337, 2066, 3078.
e . hu : – . u 1086.
e . y : a 724.
e . – : a 4171.
e . – : aw 1660.
e . – : e 3801.
e . – : o 1621, 3974.
– . e : a 265, 357.
– . e : e 469, 1239.
– . e : o 1663.
he . haw : o 2701.
he . hey : o 166.

i.

i . a : a 4079, 4310.
i . a : ay 4136.
i . a : e 4142.
i . e : a 1490, 1498.
i . e : e 1411.
i . e : ew 573.
i . e : o 4246.
i . e : ow 575.
i . e : u (? ey, or wo) 4061.
i . i : ow 2359.
i . o : ow 3535.
i . u : e 1943.
i . u : o 31.
i . – : ay 1329.
i . – : e 86, 2009.
– . i : a 1439.
io . a : a 1739.

o.

o . a : a 903.
o . a : ay 470.
o . a : e 3212.
o . a : o 202.
o . a : ho 4062.
o . ha : a 988.
o . e : a 3209.
o . e : au 278.
o . e : e 1308, 2067.
o . e : hew 1825.
o . e : o 1240.
o . he : e 359, 643.
o . i : a 2530.
o . o : au 571.
o . o : aw 3503.
o . o : i 3935.
o . o : ow 30.
o . wo : o 2723.
o . y : u 710.
ho . a : a 555, 3245.
ho . a : o 3210.
ho . a : hy 99.
ho . au : e 4170.
ho . e : a 1595.
ho . o : he 1286.
ho . u : o 400.
ho . – : ow 1328.
ho . a : whi 3148.

ow . a	: u	2841.	ow . o	: a	2849.
ow . e	: a	642.	o . –	: a	3206.
ow . e	: au	2244.	– . o	: e	774.
ow . e	: e	1664.			

u.

u . a	: a	418.	u . e	: ho	1622, 1904.
u . a	: o	2869.	u . hi	: a	625.
u . ay	: e	2604.	u . u	: aw	3967.
u . e	: au	29.	u . we	: au	2628.
u . e	: jo	1868.	u . –	: ow	2724.
u . e	: o	3676.			

y.

y . e	: a	610.

Remarks.

i. In the *Morte Arthure* what may be called *run-on alliteration,* that is to say, the repetition of the same alliterative letter through a number of successive lines, is commoner than in any other poem. Instances of this with vowels are :

vv. 571 .. 577: o . o : au; a . o : a; i . e : ew; a . a : ew; i . e : ow; a . e : e; e . o : e.
1326 .. 1329: e . a : au; a . e : a; ho : ow; i : ay.
1591 .. 1596: a . ay : e; a . e : i; a . e : a; e . aw : a; ho . e : a; a : aw.

Cp. also for similar vowel-groups vv. 1621 . . 1624; 1659 . . 1664; 1904 . . 1907; 2006 . . 2009; 2244 . . 2247; 2288 . . 2291; 2838 . . 2841, &c.

This fondness for '*coursing the letter*' through several lines running, no doubt, in part, accounts for the wealth of vowel-alliteration which we find in *Morte Arthure,* as compared with other fourteenth century poems.

ii. Another peculiarity of the *Morte Arthure* is the so-called '*piled alliteration*' *Häufung der Stäbe* (Rosenthal,

Anglia, i. 433), or redundance of the alliterative letter in a half-verse, as in ver. 809:

The conyngeste of clergye undyre **C***rist* **k***nowene*;

[cf. Schipper, I. 209]. This is very common in the case of vowels also, and makes it not always easy to determine which are the actually alliterating words, that is, the words on which the chief accents rest. Here I have found the types given by Luick (*Anglia*, xi. p. 404) useful, viz.:

A (×)⌐× ×⌐× ; A_1 ×⌐× ×⌐× ; A_2 ⌐× ×⌐
B × ×⌐×⌐; BC × ×⌐×⌐× ; C × ×⌐⌐×
C_1 × ×⌐⌐

The crosses represent syllables in thesis.

These types are based on those given by Prof. Sievers for *Béowulf* (cp. *P.B.B.* x. 212 ff.), and whether or not successful in exhibiting the complete structure of the verse, they can be safely applied for ascertaining which syllables in a half-verse bear the chief accents. I have, in my lists, invariably disregarded superfluous, and so to say *quasi* alliterations, on the ground that it is impossible to tell which of them were designed by the poet and which are merely accidental, and that their value in the verse is insignificant. A good illustration is ver. 2339 where, practically, every word begins with a vowel:

E*vene* **a***ppone* **a***ne* **o***lyfaunte* **h***ys* **e***gle* **o***wtt* **o***vere*;

compare also ver. 193:

O*wnd of* **a***zure* **a***lle* **o***ver and* **a***rdant þem semyde.*

Such extra alliteration is particularly common in the fourth arsis of a long verse: cp. 30, 99, 166, 273, 519, 572, 575, 578, 617, 903, 1016, &c., &c.

iii. Some difficulty is caused by the words *all* and *other*, especially when found together. The former, which is very common at the beginning of a half-verse, whether first or second, usually does not alliterate; e.g. 410ª, *Alle þis semly* **s***orte*; 527ª, *In alle þe* **p***lacez ther I* **p***assede*; cp. 377ª, 426ª, 489ª, 533ª, &c., &c., and similarly 425ᵇ, *of alle þa*

faire rewmes; 201[b] *alle of clene silvyre*; cf. 93[b], 382[b], 1781[b], 1763[b], &c. Consequently, in 1740[b], *and alle þase este marchez* (cp. 3211[b]), and 2608[b], *and alle þa owte landes*, the alliteration is no doubt on the second adjective, and in 2635[b], *þat alle þe erthe lowttede*, on the noun. This is quite in accordance with ancient usage; cp. *ealne wîdeferhð* (*Béowulf* 1222[a]), *ealle þâ wôcre* (*Genesis* 1409), and see Rieger, p. 23. So again in the first half-verse, we may neglect the *alle* in 29[a], *of alle that Uter in erthe* (cp. 4161[a]), and 521[a], *That alle his ancestres aughte*. I have noted no certain instance of *all* having the alliteration before a substantive in the first half-verse, and only one in the second; viz., 1009[b], *alle þis sevene wynter*, where *seven* may be a slip for *eight* (cp. 2628[b]); for in 846[b] we have *alle this sevene wynttere*, with the accent on the definite numeral. The word *other* also stands low in alliterative rank in the fourteenth century poems. Luick (p. 397) incorrectly says that it never alliterates in the *Destruction of Troy*. In the *Morte Arthure* it has the chief letter in 45[b], *and oþer ynowe* (cp. 67[b], 202[b]), in 1869[b], *and oþer grette lordes* (cp. 3974[b], 4076[b], 4265[b]), and in 400[b], *in oþer kyngys landes*.

Both words occur together in 289[b], *of alle oþer kynges*; cp. 4301[b], and 1595[b]. The rules of alliteration as well as of verse-form are here in favour of accenting *alle* (cp. Rieger, p. 31, Luick, pp. 400, 401), an accentuation which is borne out by *Destruction of Troy* 1532[b], *and mony oþer thinges*, the more so that *monig* stands on the same footing with *eal* in the older poetry. On the other hand, where this combination occurs at the end of a verse, as in 530[b], *cheefe of alle oþer*, the rhythm is in favour of laying the stress on *oþer*.

Some uncertainty hangs over the alliteration in 273[b], *of alle men of armes*, inasmuch as in the *Morte Arthure* it is not uncommon for the chief letter to be in the final arsis (cp. Remark xi). However, before so weak a substantive as *men* we find *all* can alliterate even in a first half-verse (cp. *Destruction of Troy* 9381, *þan ordant thei all men Agamy-*

non the King), and before other substantives in certain stereotyped expressions: e.g. *Destruction of Troy* 6072ª, *armyt at all peses* (cf. 5674); and so in *William of Palerne*, *at alle poyntes*; cp. vv. 1064ᵇ, 3381ª, 3332ᵇ, &c.; therefore we must probably read the above verse as × ⌣ × × ⌣ ×, and not as: × × ⌣ × ⌣ × (cp. ver. 364).

The word *any* is in much the same case, in respect to alliterating, as *all*. In the older poetry it could either alliterate or not before a substantive in the second half-verse. Thus we have in *Béowulf* 510ᵇ *ne inc æ̂nig mon*; but in *Béowulf* 1353ᵇ, *þonne ǽnig man ôþer*. Cp. again *Béowulf* 792ᵇ, 3128ᵇ, where it alliterates, and *Genesis* 391ᵇ, 503ᵇ, where it does not. In the *Morte Arthure* there is no certain case of its alliterating in the first half-verse. It occurs without alliterating in 373ª, 1723ª, 2519ª, 3144ª. The only examples of possible alliteration are: 1659ª, *If here be any hathelle mane*, where the form of the verse, apart from the analogy of vv. 373ª, &c., is against accenting *any*, and 577ª, *That any erthe ocupyes*, where the two last words are clearly the ones which alliterate. There is also ver. 2833, a possible, but unlikely case of crossed alliteration (cp. Remark viii). In the second half-verse, the only case which has come before me is 1016ᵇ, *or any of hys elders*, where however, it is better to take *hys* as having the chief letter (see Remark viii).

iv. Prepositions can alliterate at the cost not only of a following pronoun, which was permissible even in the best period, but also of a following substantive; cp. 305ᵇ, 710ᵇ, 903ª, and 1878ª, 2724ª, 3482ᵇ. A doubtful case is ver. 4061:

Now isschewis his enmye undire þe wode eynys.

From ver. 3482:

Here es ane enmye with oste undire ȝone vynes;

one is at first inclined to take *undire* as alliterating rather than *eynys*[1]. There is however a third alternative: *wode*; compare ver. 2723:

In ȝone okene wode an oste are arrayede.

[1] But wrongly. Cf. next page and p. 67.

In two instances in the *Morte Arthure* we have in like manner the impure diphthong *we* joining in vowel alliteration, viz.:

3449 *Es* **e**n*tirde in thyne* **a**b*sence to* **w**e*rraye thy pople.*
and 2628 *That he* **u**se*de in* **w**e*rre alle this* **au**g*hte wyntter*.*

It may be noted here that impure diphthongs, such as *ie, iu, io, uo*, in which the accented element is a sound of less natural strength than the unaccented (cp. Sievers, *Phonetik*[3], 143; Luick, *P.B.B.* xvi. 336), are of rare occurrence in vowel alliteration. As a rule it is the pure or falling diphthongs, especially those with initial *a* (viz. *ai, au*), the most powerful of all the vowels, which are so used. In the *Destruction of Troy* v. 923 we have an instance of *iu*, viz.

Is **e**r*dand in* **J**u*de as* **I**s*oder sais,*

where Luick (p. 429) suggests the reading **I***nde*. The diphthong *ea* (so common in the *Béowulf*) also occurs twice, viz. *D. of T.* 9067, 9661. In the *Morte Arthure* we have, besides the above examples, the impure diphthong *io* in v. 1739; **J**o*neke and* **A**s*kanere.* **A**l*aduke and o*þ*er*, and again in vv. 1868, 1905. So also in *Piers Plowman* we have *ȝe*,—

A. text vii. 251 *Arys vp ar* **a**p*petyt habbe i-*ȝ*eten his fulle* and
B. „ i. 152 *Tyl it* **h**a*dde of the* **e**r*the.* **y**e*ten his fylle.*
and *ȝo*,
C. „ ii. 151 *Til it* **h**a*dde on* **e**r*the.* **ȝ**o*ten hym-selue.*

v. Occasionally in *M.A.* we have mixed **h**- and vowel alliteration. Trautmann denies this, except in doubtful cases (*Anglia*, i. 123). The following examples however seem unquestionable:

1286. **H**o*rnez of* **o**l*yfantez fulle* **h**e*lych blawene*
1825. *Sir* **O**r*igge &* *syr* **E**r*myngalle* **h**e*wene al to pecez.*
2701. *His* **h**e*lme and his* **h**aw*berke thay takene* **o**f *aftyre.*
3148. *Be* **h**o*magers to* **A**r*thure* **w**h*illes his lyffe lastis,* cp. 1675, 1825, 2974.

* These examples appear to contradict what Professor Sievers says in *Altg. Metrik* § 18 *Anm.* viz. that *solche alliterationen der westgerm. poesie völlig fremd sind*, unless we recognise here Norse influence.

In 620[b] *alle þas hye landez* it is possibly the *alle* that alliterates, but more probably not (cp. Remark iii). Whether the intrusive *h* in the very common word *hathell* is to be pronounced or not is doubtful. It certainly should be so in v. 2109 *Bot zitte þe* h*athelieste on* h*y* h*aythene and oþer*, for here it comes in the midst of an h-tirade. Sometimes, however, the word is spelt without the *h*, e. g. *atheliste* v. 1593. The *h* in *heghte* v. 2831 is perhaps a scribal error due to the influence of the *h* in the preceding word *hand*. Other forms of the numeral are *awughte* 3189, *aughte* 2628.

vi. Where a verb and following adverb both begin with a vowel it is sometimes doubtful which of the two alliterates. Luick (p. 398) points out that in Modern English, contrary to what obtains in German, it is the verb which is generally accented. In accordance with this, it is the verb which in the *Destruction of Troy* usually alliterates, though not universally; cp. *D. of T.* 389, 504. In the *M. A.* we have an exception in 2701[b] quoted above (v.), and perhaps too in 4163[a] *enters in on the* o*ste*, where we obtain a better form of verse by accenting *in*; compare *Cleanness* 349[a] '*enter* i*n þenne,' quoth* h*e*, where there is the same ground for laying the stress on i*n*.

vii. The pronoun '*I*' alliterates in 4152[a] *He es* e*ldare than* I, and not again, as far as I know, in any other place, except in *Piers Plowman* B. v. 640[a]. '*Ne* I' *quod an* a*pewarde* (cp. C. viii. 284). The nearest approach to these cases is that of *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* v. 1242[a] *þaȝ I be not now* h*e*, where the first accent seems to fall best on the *not*.

Another strikingly weak word found in arsis, and even admitted to alliteration, is the verb *is* ('*es*'). Compare

817. S*othely and certayne thy* s*elvene it és.*
3502. *ffor he* e*s in this* e*mpire, as* h*athelle men me telles.*
519. *I saye the syr* A*rthure* e*s thyne* e*nmye fore ever.*
265. *þou sees þat þe* E*mperour* e*s* a*ngerde a lyttille.*

In the last two verses **es** stands before the mid cæsura and receives an accent from the pause. The cæsura in these cases is, it must be confessed, a purely artificial one. Luick (p. 596) observes that the boundary between the two half-verses is occasionally obliterated in the *M.A.*, as in other XIV century poems. But such an artificial cæsura is not unknown even in *Béowulf*. Cf. v. 12. *þæm* **eá***fera wæs.* **æ***fter cenned.*

In the second of the above examples **es** is clearly in the first arsis, and therefore may fairly be held to alliterate. Similar is the case of *are* in

v. 1327ª '*ȝe* **a***re with myne* **e***nemy,*'

and again in

v. 2289ª *per* **a***re of the* **O***rient.*

The possessive pronoun could alliterate by itself before a following noun in *Béowulf*, at least in the second half verse. Cf. vv. 345, 2532 &c., and see Rieger, p. 31. In the *M. A.* such a thing is rare, but occurs in v. 2803ª *And* **A***rthure one* **ou***re syde*, and so probably v. 2368ᵇ *none of* **ou***re elders*, and probably too in v. 1016ᵇ *or any of* **hy***s elders* (see Remark iii).

viii. The same word does not always alliterate on the same syllable. Thus we have: **a***llas* 3966, *allas* 1153; **a***vawmwarde* 3169, 3765 and usually, but **a***vawmwarde* 2830: **G***awayne* 2579 &c., but *Gawayne* 3920; **ú***ndone* 3967, but *und***ó***ne* 3753; *enveroune*s 4125, but **e***nveryde* 1694; **e***namelde* (probably) in 765, 2027 &c., but **e***nnelled* 1294; **w***ithowttyne* 2500, but *with***ow***ttyne* 3590, *withowttyne* 114. Verbal compounds with *en-* usually alliterate with the second syllable, e. g. *encroche* 3213, *endordid* 199. An exception seems, at first sight, to occur in v. 307 *To entyce the Emperour to take overe the mounttes.* Judging from the first half-verse we must pronounce *éntyce*; the second half-verse, however, leans rather towards *entýce*; since, in accordance with what has been said in Remark vi, it is

more natural for the verb *take* to alliterate, than for the following adverb to do so. The alliteration therefore seems to waver in this verse, a strange phenomenon peculiar, I think, to the *Morte Arthure*. It occurs again:

v. 910 *The* v*esare þe* a*ventaile enarmede so faire*
v. 1096 R*uyd* a*rmes as an* a*ke with* r*usclede sydes*
v. 4137 *I see syr* E*wayne* o*versette with* S*araȝenes kene*
v. 3717 *Sir* A*rthure &* G*awayne* a*vyede them bothene.*

Compare also vv. 2868, 3590, 357.

In this connection may be mentioned one or two examples of crossed alliteration: (i) of ab : ab in v. 2628 *That he* u*sede in* w*erre alle this* au*ghte* w*yntter* (where vowel and half-vowel alternate); also in vv. 1175, 3444; and (ii) of ba : ab in vv. 1259, 2833.

ix. The adverb *anon* usually alliterates with the *n* in the *Destruction of Troy*, with the *a* in *William of Palerne*. In the *M. A.* it seems to do so with the *o*, cp. vv. 2717, 2841, 4264; and notice too *onóne*, vv. 571, 2006, 2067.

x. The peculiar *n*-alliteration of the *Destruction of Troy*, cp. *D. of T.* 101, *An yle enabit nobli and wele*, noticed by Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. 126), and Schipper (i. 207), seems to peep out in

v. 1905 *Be an awntere of armes Joneke has* n*ommene,*

in which case this verse is another instance of the wavering alliteration mentioned above.

A similar end-alliteration seems to occur with *w* in

2987 *Thorow owte be rerewarde he holdes* w*ayes.*

The alliteration of the *t* in the phrase *þe tother* also belongs here: compare

234 *Sir Owȝhtreth on þe* t*other syde of* T*urry was lorde*;
but 2530 *The* t*oþer* i*rously* a*nswers hyme sone.*

Cp. *Dest. of Troy*, 6198[a] . . *þat* o*ther*; 7905[b] *and þat* t*othir.*

We have t*oþer* again in

3410 *The* t*oþer Ector of* T*roye, the* ch*evalrous gume,*

a verse in which the chief letter seems at first sight missing, but must be sought for in *ch*(=*tsh*); a singular alliteration found again in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, 1512:

þat **ch***aunce so by-tydez hor* **ch***euysaunce to change.*

That the *ch-* in *chevalrous* was pronounced *tsh*, and not, as often now, *sh*, can be seen from such alliterations as **ch***efe* **ch***evalrye* v. 18 (cp. **ch***osyne*, **ch***eftayne*, **ch***eefe*, 530; and see also vv. 1362, 1404, 1540, 1619, 1822, &c.).

The case in question is interesting as an evidence that the poet was guided in his alliterations by the ear, and not by the eye. In these days of reading it is the alliteration to the eye which catches our attention first, so that even Messrs. Seeley and Abbott can quote Shakespeare's—

Our dreadful marches to delightful measures

as an instance of crossed alliteration **ab** : **ab** (See *Engl. Lessons for Engl. People*), as if there were alliteration between d*readful* and *delightful*! (Cp. ch. II. p. 4.)

xi. The chief letter is unquestionably missing in v. 4080:

A*yers with* **A***rthure, with sevene score of knyghtes,*

where it seems obviously right to read *with aughte score*, cp. 278, 3189. Less easily emended is

4344. *That was of Ectores blude the kynge sone of* **T***roye.*

We seem compelled to alliterate *Ectores*: **T***roye*, giving, it must be confessed, a very unnatural accent to the former word (though compare *Owghtreth*, v. 234). In the *Destr. of Troy*, where the name is very frequent, it is always the *E* which alliterates. For the chief letter to be in the final arsis, as in **T***roye*, is a common occurrence in the *M. A.*, more so, according to Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. 123), than in any other O. E. poem. We have instances with a vowel in vv. 1122, 2543, 2848, 2869, 3246, and perhaps in 2848.

Destruction of Troy.

a.

a . a : a — 181, 273, 762, 855, 1090, 1164, 1588, 1744, 2023, 5568, 5674, 5727, (5843), 6072, 6108, 6289, 7206, 7105, 7241, 7994, 9104, 10809, 10145, 10201, 10302, 10723, 14024, 14026.

a . a : au — 67, 1831, 1899, 5770, 5791, 6060, 6114, 6183, 10635, 10644.

a . a : aw — 1862.

a . a : ay — 1577.

a . a : e — 1087, (6249), 7329.

a . a : o — 5692, 8903.

a . ai : e — 110.

a . ai : y — 5784.

a . au : a — 1940, 6159, 6625, 6861, 9515, 9541, 10063, 10538, 10608, 10692, 10804.

a . aw : a — 276.

a . aw : ai — 5707.

a . haw : a — 12937.

a . e : a — 1612, 1765.

a . e : e — 9107.

a . ew : o — 1479.

a . o : au — 2856.

a . o : o — 6356, 9288, 9797.

au . a : a — 537, 2040, 7949, 9415, 9419, 9527, 9801, 10602, 10612.

au . a : e — 6640.

au . e : a — 6216, 6399.

au . e : e — 724, 7085, 7245, 7306.

au . e : o — 7254.

au . o : a — 6319.

au . o : au — 5.

au . o : o — 9375.

au . u : a — 9745.

ay . a : a — 9088.

ay . e : a — 175, 7314.

ay . o : e — 173.

ay . u : au — 531.

e.

e . a : a — 46, 1441, 6874, 7229, 7384, 8895, 8919, 10668, 10760, 10865.

e . a : au — 314, 517, 6617, 7006, 10667, 10821, 14035.

e . a : e — 121, 1491, 7056, 7322, 7344, 7947.

e . a : i — 7119.

e . a : o — 852, 9185, 10590.

e . a : u — 1053.

e . a : y — 6222.

e . au : a — 6392.

e . au : au — 6796, 6889.

e . au : e — 6725, 6810.

e . au : o — 1121, 7391.

e . e : a — 5602, 6424.

e . e : au — 6490.

e . e : e — 126, 143, 264, 294, 1002, 1390, 5920, 6413, 6456, 6599, 6712, 6803, 6835, 6843, 6855, 6934, 6993, 7128, 7300, 7404, 7424, 7919, 9234, 10320, 10493.

e . e : ea — 7988.

e . e : i — 749.

e . e : y 1633.
e . ea : e 9067, 9661.
e . hei : e 394.
e . i : e 1936.
e . iu : i 923.
e . o : a 819, 8901.
e . o : au 6117, 6359, 7250.
e . o : e { 2, 410, 961, 6198, 7219, 7907.
e . o : hei 1476.
e . o : o { 6194, 6708, 6745, 6859, 9203.
e . o : ho 9537.
e . o : ou 6404.

e . ho : a 7187.
e . ho : aw 9164.
e . ho : e { 5950, 6065, 7233, 11969.
e . ho : he { 5950, 6065, 7233, 9343.
e . ho : o 6157, 14031.
e . ow : a 6088.
e . ow : au 6166.
e . ow : e 6792.
e . ow : o 6021, 6237.
e . y : e 1330.
hei . e : e 115.

i.

i . a : o 4313; i . e : a 6013; i . o : a 6998; f . i : f . e 7345.

o.

o . a : a { 617, 7215, 7367, 9381, 14012.
o . a : au 742, 6055, 10615.
o . a : aw 1960.
o . a : e 1471, 1600.
o . a : o 281.
o . a : ow 5565.
o . au : a 6376.
o . e : e { 6048, 6704, 7136, 9239.
o . e : o { 6179, 6189, 7388, 8955.
o . e : ho 9219.
o . he : u 328.
o . o : e 7358.
o . o : ey 123.
o . o : o { 48, 151, 165, 553, 7205, 9096, 10312.

o . o : u 877.
o . ho : o 1919.
o . oy : ho 6169.
ho . a : a 11831.
ho . a : u 11661.
ho . e : a 6303, 10806, 11840.
ho . e : au { 6930, 9362, 9725, 14006.
ho . e : e { 288, 3007, 6677, 7379, 9110, 9258, 10482.
ho . e : o { 6305, 7074, 9093, 9121, 9768, 10331, 10469, 10839.
ho . o : a 9743.
ho . o : o 12944.
ho . u : u 11753.
oy . a : o 6172.

u.

u . a : a	6894.	u . y : ho	3447.
u . au : a	1679, 6911.	u . y : u	7981.
u . u : u	1545, 5801, 5808, 5819.		

y.

y . a : a	6402.	y . e : o	4426.
y . a : o	2858.	y . o : a	9298.
y . a : y	6531.	y . o : o	6202.
y . ai : a	897.	y . ho : o	1646.

REMARKS.

i. The metrical regularity of the *Destruction of Troy* can escape no one. It was pointed out by Trautmann (*Anglia*, i. 125), and again by Schipper (i. 211). Luick takes this poem as the basis of his metrical treatise, '*Die englische Stabreimzeile im XIV. &c. Jhrhd.*' (*Anglia*, xi. 392.)

The alliterative scheme **a . a : a** :– is carried out with even monotonous exactness. Only twice in the first 2000 verses does the variety –. **a** : **a**– occur, viz. in verses 453 and 806 (Luick, p. 394). The last verse of Book xvi. describing the third battle, which is another exception, gives us by way of compensation a particularly good example of crossed alliteration **a b : a b**, viz. 7345:

ffore to þere Innes & þus the fight endit.

Thus the task of determining the alliterating words where there is vowel alliteration is extremely easy for this poem.

ii. Trautmann (*ib.* 126) remarks that the alliteration in this poem is often upon the same vowel in all three arses. This peculiarity again, though directly contrary to ancient usage, is unmistakeable, as a glance at the above lists will show. Of the 167 examples given, all three vowels are alike in 35 cases, two out of the three in 91, and in

only 41 instances are all the vowels different. Where the vowels are not all alike, however, the difference is often made merely by a pure diphthong, the first element of which is the same vowel as in the other arses e.g. **a . a : au**, verses 67, 1831, &c., and as the stress of pronunciation was upon the first element of a diphthong the variation from identity of vowel is in such cases only apparent. Complete dissimilarity as in the combination **e . a : o**, verses 9185, 10590, occurs in only 23 of the 167 examples given above.

iii. There has been some question as to whether in the *Destruction of Troy* the aspirated *h* ever alliterates with a vowel. Trautmann (*ib.* 126) says *not*; Bock (p. 16) affirms that it does very frequently in the case of romance words. Luick (p. 428) rightly says that in these the *h* is disregarded. He explains away the apparent instance in ver. 9343:

Whethur **E***lan be so* **h***onerable, or of so* **h***egh prise,*

by saying that here no doubt the poet intended the original aspirated form of the proper name. In another case, cited by Bock, *hawne*, ver. 12937[a]:

A*gamynons* **h***awne sone*

we have doubtless a mere scribal peculiarity.

iv. Luick (pp. 397, 425) falls into error with regard to the word *other*, saying that it never alliterates, and appears to have been always unaccented. Instances to the contrary are:

48[a] **O***uyd and* **o***thir* (cp. 819[a], 961[a], 7388[a]); 7205[a] *Without* **o***rdinaunce of* **o***ther* (cp. 9203[a]); 6198[a] *And* **E***sdras þat* **o***ther*; 7219[a] **E***ctor on the* **o***ther side.*

Luick also says, no doubt correctly, that *all* usually does not alliterate in the *Destruction of Troy*. It occurs however in the chief arsis in ver. 8895:

I haue not **e***rrit in* **a***nythyng of* **a***ll my tyme yet,*

and in verses 10590, 10760, it takes the alliteration from a following substantive, in each case, however, a weak one:

Erles and all men oght of astate
And Elan, of all wemen, angardly fast.

In ver. 328:

With all odour of herbis þat on vrthe springes,

the metre is in favour of accenting *odour* in preference to *all*.

Sometimes, as in the *Morte Arthure*, we have to decide between the claims of *all* and *other* to alliterate, e.g.

v. 852 *Entris with armur and all his other gere.*
v. 9185 *Noght Ector of all other, oddist of knightes.*

In the former verse rhythm and sense are both in favour of *other*; in the latter rhythm at least favours *other* (cp. *Morte Arthure*, 530[b]).

v. *Redundant alliteration* is less frequent than in *Morte Arthure*, but occasionally occurs, e.g. ver. 1330:

Ercules yreful euer vponone

(cp. 1390), where every word begins with a vowel, and again ver. 48:

Ouyd and othir þat onest were ay.

There is too in the *Destruction of Troy* a very peculiar tendency for the last word of a verse with vowel alliteration to begin with a vowel even when the vowel is not accented:

e.g. 897 *Bothe of ymur & aire, after I-wise*
1121 *Then Ercules the Avntrus onswarid Anon—*

cp. verses 961, 3447, 8955, 8989, 9096, 9743, 9831, 10590.

vi. As in the *Morte Arthure*, the preposition can alliterate to the disadvantage of a following noun or even adjective, e.g.

v. 1053 *Entrid into Aries vnder a signe*
v. 8901 *Ne entrid not the ost till after two yeres.*

vii. In one instance the indefinite article *a* takes the alliteration! viz. ver. 1441 :

Hit was **e**uyn *bot* **a** *venture of* **A**ngur *to come,*

where it seems to be joined on to the following word in the same way as the *n* of the other form of this article in the already mentioned *n*-alliteration of this poem (cp. *Morte Arthure*, Remark x). We have *possibly* a similar case in *Morte Arthure*, ver. 903 :

Aboven **o**ne *þat* **a** *jeryne of* **A**cres *owte over,*

but as the occurrence of two alliterating syllables in the first half-verse is by no means so regular in this poem as in the *Destruction of Troy*, it is difficult to feel sure in the matter. (For earlier examples of alliteration on the indef. art. cp. *B.* 1886[b], *Gen.* 880[b], 2226[b].)

viii. The word *am* alliterates, in

7949 *If* **a**untur *be, sir* **A**chilles, *I* **a**m *the to sle.*

William of Palerne.

a.

a . a : a	59, 235, 629,	a . a	: ha	4921.	
	645, 649, 813,	a . a	: hi	864.	
	834, 861, 874,	a . a	: o	136, 1306, 3381.	
	913, 941, 958,	a . a	: –	3769.	
	967, 976, 1015,	a . e	: a	3950.	
	1028, 1041, 1048,	a . he	: e	1469.	
	1064, 1414, 1517,	a . o	: a	568.	
	1528, 1532, 1667,	a . –	: a	586, 1499, 4248, 4816, 4863, 5222, 5229, 5277, 5446.	
	1701, 1734, 1760,				
	1993, 2004, 2062,				
	3220, 3278, 3332,	a . –	: au	921.	
	3423, 3476, 3670,	a . –	: hu	363.	
	3784, 3885, 3963,				
	4358, 4452, 4508,				
	4537, 4565, 4595,				
	4672, 4708, 4737,				
	4885, 4958, 4991,				
	5040, 5155, 5308,				
	5409.				

e.

e	. a	: a	273, 404.	e	. ei	: e	709, 1474.
e	. a	: he	1445.	e	. ey	: e	4641.
e	. a	: i	882, 2479.	e	. o	: ho	1106.
e	. e	: a	1881, 1906.	e	. ou	: hi	3229.
e	. e	: e	168, 205, 272, 1093, 1130, 1417, 1632, 5260, 5269, 5338, 5412.	he	. ha	: a	441.
				he	. hei	: a	1875.
				he	. hi	: o	389.
				he	. o	: a	3032.
e	. e	: he	276.	he	. o	: ha	1010.
e	. e	: i	3755.	he	. hu	: i	688.
e	. e	: hi	1261.	ei	. e	: e	1612.
e	. e	: o	5400.	e	. –	: a	166.
e	. e	: hu	2515.	e	. –	: e	2519.
e	. e	: ȝe	1429.	e	. –	: e	232, 3105.

o.

o	. a	: a	3220.	ho	. e	: he	1768.
o	. a	: he	5403.	ho	. o	: he	295, 3797.
o	. he	: ha	3633.	o	. –	: a	3814.
o	. o	: a	1069.	o	. –	: i	4952.
o	. o	: i	3791.	–	. o	: o	1402.
o	. oy	: a	139.	ou	. e	: e	3646.
ho	. a	: he	1103.	ou	. o	: a	1080, 3745.

i. In regard to vowel alliteration, *William of Palerne* presents a more striking contrast to the *Béowulf* than any poem we have yet examined. I have found only 131 certain instances of it in a total of 5540 verses, or about 2·35 per cent., whereas in *Béowulf* we have about 490 instances in 3184 verses, or 15·4 per cent. Again, in *William of Palerne*, the alliteration turns almost entirely on the three vowels **a**, **e**, **o**, and a strong preference is shown for keeping the vowel the same in all three arses of the verse, by far the most favourite combination being **a . a : a**, which occurs 54 times. The alliteration **e . e : e** occurs eleven times; so that together these two combinations are found in 65 out of the whole number of 131 examples of vowel alliteration in the poem. Scarcely ever do we find a different vowel in

all three arses. Excluding such cases as **ho . a : he**, ver. 1103, where the rough breathing enters, actually or in appearance, I have observed only two instances of complete variation, viz., **e . a : i**, vv. 882, 2479. In the first of these, ver. 882:

and eft red as rose . in a litel while,

the alliteration is of the weakest, and seems in the first half-verse to waver between the vowels and the consonants; in the second example, ver. 2479:

but eche man al niȝt . inned him where he miȝt

it is fairly strong.

This tendency to preserve the alliterating vowel unchanged was noticed in the *Destruction of Troy*. It is seen at its height in the *Gestes of Alisaunder*, in which there are but four instances of alliteration between different vowels. This was pointed out by Rosenthal (*Anglia*, i. 439), who finds in the fact an argument against Mr. Skeat's opinion that *William of Palerne* and the *Alexander* are by the same author. The *Alexander* is, however, only one-fourth as long as *William of Palerne*, and, if we take into account the difficulty which restricting the alliteration to one vowel would impose on the poet, the difference between the two poems in regard to vowel alliteration seems insufficient to justify any argument as to difference of authorship.

ii. There is a great sameness among the instances with the combination **a . a : a**, most of which in the earlier part of the poem contain the name *alisaundrine*, whilst later on that of *alphouns* is of frequent occurrence. The formula *anon answered and saide* is as common as the τόνδ' ἀπαμειβόμενος of Homer: cp. vv. 645, 958, 967, 1048, 1667, &c.; so, too, we find again and again *anon atteled*; cp. vv. 813, 861, 941, &c.; *anon after þat ilk*, 629, 1041, &c., and other such stereotyped expressions.

iii. The alliteration falls occasionally on words which have naturally very slight or no sentence stress. Thus in

ver. 882, quoted above, the preposition *in* has the chief letter even before a noun, and so again in 3791, 4952. The same thing occurs with *on*, 3381, 4565; and *at*, 166, 1414, 5040; also with *to*, 596; *from*, 3614; *wiþ*, 3000, 4498, &c. The word *and* seems to alliterate in 5277ª, and again in 3950ᵇ, unless in the latter case it is the indefinite article *a* which does so, as in the *Destruction of Troy*, 1441. The conjunction *as* alliterates in 273ᵇ, 976ᵇ, 1881ᵇ, &c., and the verb *am* in 1532ᵇ.

Speaking of such cases, Mr. Skeat says (*Essay on All. Poetry*, p. 7), 'By a very bold licence, the *chief letter* even occurs in the initial catch of the second line.' Rosenthal (*Anglia*, i.) questions this, preferring to ignore the alliteration in such half-verses, and Luick also (*Anglia*, xi.) overlooks it, scanning, for example, *William of Palerne*, 4ᵇ, *þat was a coúhérde*, as a C verse (Sievers); cp. p. 568, also 581. That the alliteration in them was *intentional* is clear from their frequency; to what extent it was *real* is not an easy question. Some stress the words with the quasi chief-letter must have had, otherwise the alliteration would have been without effect. It may help towards a solution, if we compare some half-verses in which a naturally proclitic word (for example, *with*) has the alliteration, with others similarly constructed, in which it has not. Thus we have:

604ᵇ *wiþ þi mede wordes*	1646ᵇ *wiþ þi faire wordes*
1060ᵇ *wiþ riche & wiþ pore*	5442ᵇ *wiþ lasse & wiþ more*
2606ᵇ *wiþ ful ȝode houndes*	1060ᵇ *wiþ ful faire ȝiftes*
409ᵇ *wiþ him he ladde*	3667ᵇ *wiþ hem þan sche went*

Cp., too, 2109 and 1261; 3311 and 1337; 1083 and 3232.

In the case of 409ᵇ, no doubt the word *wiþ* really does alliterate, since even in Old English verse prepositions could do so before a pronoun (cp. Rieger, p. 32). The other half-verses in the left-hand column, one is disposed at first sight to scan similarly to the corresponding verses on the right, disregarding the alliteration. Two reasons, however,

may be urged against this course, viz. (1) that in the case of individual words varying alliteration, and therefore, presumably, varying accentuation, is not uncommon; for example:

*a*lisaundrine 629, 645, &c., &c., but *ali*saundrine 1979, 2028, 2065.
*s*tepmoderes 130, but *step*moder 2640 (compare *appeltre* 753).
*þ*emperour 232, 272, &c., but *þ*emperour 429, 1127; and even *þem*perour 1180, 1390.
*a*skes 235, 2062, &c., but *a*skes 69.
*a*nswered 645, 958, &c., but *an*swered 70.
*a*boute 89, 220, &c., but *a*boute 4358.
*a*tir 4537, but *a*tir 3884.

and (2) that words naturally of the strongest accent, substantives and adjectives, are occasionally found not only in the thesis succeeding the first alliterating word of a half-verse, but also in that preceding it, as in the following examples:

137[b] *þat euel* ch*a*nce *hire tide.*
381[b] *gret* h*e*lp *þer-of after.*
368[b] *þemperour* n*a*m *hede.*
315[b] *but god* d*o his wille.*
59[b] *þat childern* a*f*ter *wilnen.*
420[b] *þe bestes* s*e*þþen *ware.*
463[a] *min eiȝen* s*o*rly *aren* s*o*gettes.
1800[b] *to meliors* s*o hende.*
344[b] *þe worse* b*e*stow *neuere.*
190[b] *a-day* w*i*þ *his bowe.*
307[b] *as lord* w*i*þ *his owne.*

In every one of these instances the strict rules of Old English alliteration are violated (cp. Rieger, pp. 19 and 25, § iv, 1 and 4), most flagrantly so in the last two, but also in the others, in an ascending scale of enormity. It is manifest that, as regards alliteration, they stand or fall together, for it is impossible to draw any line between them. Moreover, except in the *Auftakt*, these verses are perfectly regular, presenting the types, A $(\times)\,\acute{-}\times\,\times\,\acute{-}\times$, C $\times\,\times\,\acute{-}\,\acute{-}\times$, BC $\times\,\times\,\acute{-}\times\,\acute{-}\times$, which Luick (*Anglia*, xi. 568) finds to occur in *William of Palerne* in the ordinary manner; whereas if we ignore the alliterating word and place

the preceding noun in the first arsis, we get in some instances, particularly in 463ª, sadly misshapen verses.

I conclude, therefore, that the poet intended *wiþ* to be accented in vv. 190ᵇ, 307ᵇ, just as he meant *sorly* to have the accent in 463ª, and that the words *lord* and *eizen* should be somewhat slurred in the reading.

In modern verse, in anapæstic verse especially, we are familiar enough with having to hurry over words of similar weight in the thesis, as in the second of the following well-known lines of Byron:

> And the sheén | of his spéars | was like stárs | on the séa
> Where the blúe | *wave rolls night* | ly on deep | Galilee.

We even admit in this position words made emphatic by antithesis, as in Mr. Gilbert's amusing—

> *You* líke my feátures Í suppóse
> *I*'m dísappoínted wíth my nóse—

in the '*Mountebanks*.' In cases like these there is no doubt a conflict between the 'ideal rhythm and the real' (cp. Scherer, *Zur Gesch. d. deutschen Spr.*² 628) greater than would have been tolerated by the ancient ear, more intent to catch the music, less absorbed in the meaning, of a verse than the modern. But the author of *William of Palerne* is one of the least skilful, even in the Silver Age of alliterative poetry, and it is not surprising if the licence we have been discussing is more common with him than with his contemporaries, excepting Langland[1].

The same arguments will hold *a fortiori* for the prepositions *wiþoute* and *wiþinne*, which alliterate not unfrequently with the *w*; cp. vv. 259, 316, 533, 542, 1639, 1900, 2041, 2350, 2464, 2685, 3660, 4608, 4731, 4813, 4807, 5457, and 685, 2956, 3652, and will also cover the case of other prepositions and particles.

[1] The same licence of alliterating the preposition before a substantive is found even in the Old English version of the Psalms, and occasionally in other poems of the decadence. Cf. Rieger, p. 33.

The postposition *with* alliterates in 4797[b] *perwith wold be slaked* (cp. 138[a]) quite according to rule; just so in *Béowulf* we have *fand þâ þær inne* (118[a]), *þâ hê him of dyde* (672[a]); and in *Genesis* 1052[a] *eastlandum on*. Probably the irregular alliterations we have been discussing may be traced in part to these regular uses.

iv. Alliteration of the rough with the smooth breathing does occur in *William of Palerne*, but not very frequently. Apart from merely apparent cases in which the initial *h* is merely orthographical, as in *heritage*, 1445[b], written also *eritage*, 4641[b], we have **h**ors *and* **a**rmes, 1103[a]; *to bi-***h**old *the* **e**stres, 1768[a]; *þer is* **h**olli *al here* **o**st, 3797[a], &c.

v. The word *anon* alliterates usually with the *a*, but also with the *n*; cf. 3537[b]. It appears to do so in ver. 136[a]:

a noynement anon sche made . of so grete strengthe,

but *a noynement* is of course to be read *an oynement*, the word *of* in the second half-verse clearly showing that in the first half-verse we have vowel, and not *n*-, alliteration. I have noticed indeed only two instances of a word alliterating by help of the end-consonant of the word preceding it, viz. 1127:

how þemperour wiþ ost . þider was come,

and 3435:

þat þe **s**ame *seg hade* **s**lawe . *his em þer-to-fore,*

but there are probably several others.

vi. The word *alone* alliterates with the *a* in vv. 1528, 1532 (*allone*) (cp. **a**live, 4816; **a**lgate, 1064, 1414; **a**las, 388; but *al*way, 345). The indefinite *al* alliterates before a substantive, 1517, and similarly *alle*, 59, 1064, 3381, 3728, 3423, &c.; so also does the indefinite *ani*, vv. 568, 404, 1080.

vii. Crossed alliteration, **a b a b**, occurs in vv. 108, 278, 1585, 2628, 3398; and **b a a b** in 888, 1908, 3259. Of the latter examples, ver. 888, at any rate, seems due to art and not accident:

Bot **a**lisaundrine **w**iste *wel* . **w**hat *þat him* **e**yled.

viii. The pointing is at fault in 5446,

and to **a**lisaundrine **a**non . *riȝt þei sayde.*

The cæsural point should be placed after *alisaundrine*, and not after *anon* as in the text. Cp. ver. 4816:

and ȝif **a**lisaundrine . *were þanne* **a**liue.

ix. The expression *eiþer . . oþer* presents some difficulty in ver. 1010:

þan eiþer hent oþer . hastely in armes.

From ver. 1908, however:

þan eiþer lapped oþer . ful loueli in armes,

it is plain that the verb *hent* above occupies one arsis, whilst from 3391[b] *eþir* **m**ette *oþer* we see that the *eiþer* can take a subordinate position to the *oþer* since here *eiþer* is in the *Auftakt*, *oþer* in the second arsis of the half-verse. We may therefore conclude to alliterate ver. 1010[a]:

þan eiþer **h**ent *oþer.*

and so 3032:

and **h**endli *eiþer oþer . þan colled in* **a**rmes.

In 3854[a] **G**rimli *eiþer oþer* **g**ret both words are in thesis (cp. too 3814). If this view of the relation of the two words in this expression be correct it must be confessed they offer an exception to the rule for Old English verse, that of two pronouns in the same half-verse the one which comes first takes the alliteration; a rule however which was occasionally broken even by the older poets (cf. Rieger, p. 31).

ALEXANDER.

a

a . a	: a	22, 27, 268, 461, 500, 1094, 1148.		a . e	: e	240.	
a . a	: au	109, 230, 415, 547, 902, 1017.		a . o	: au	290.	
a . ai	: au	1027.		au . a	: a	498	
				au . e	: e	592.	
				a . –	: a	491.	

e.

e	. æ	: e	454.			e	. e	: yi 280.
e	. e	: e	408, 424, 464, 486, 552, 595, 908, 1091.			ei	. e	: e 338.
						e	. –	: y 1086.
						eu	. –	: u 34.

i.

i . i : i 616.

o.

o	. a	: o	695.			o	. –	: a 135.
o	. o	: a	177.			o	. –	: o 576.
o	. o	: o	664.	738.				

Remarks.

i. Vowel alliteration in the *Alexander* fragments is almost as scanty as in *William of Palerne*. Rosenthal (*Anglia*, i. 414), found only 33 examples. He however omitted ver. 1094, **a . a : a**; ver. 908, **e . e : e**; verses 109, 902, **a . a : au**; and ver. 34, **eu .– : u**. These bring the total up to 38, which gives a percentage of 3 out of the whole number of 1249 verses in the poem.

ii. As Rosenthal points out, the alliteration in a verse usually runs upon the same vowel throughout, or if there is any variation it is due to a diphthong the fundamental vowel of which is the one alliterating e. g. **a . a : au**, 230; **ei. e : e**, 338. Rosenthal finds only four instances of alliteration between wholly different vowels, viz., **a . o : au**, 290; **o . a : o**, 695; **e . e : y**, 280; and **e .– : i**, 1086. To these I should add 177:

Olympias þe onorable . over all hue hyȝht,

taken by Rosenthal as an example of **o . o : o**. (In *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* these two words appear as a compound—*over-al*, which is no doubt to be accented

on the first syllable. Cp. *Sir G. and the G. K.*, ver. 150,

and ȯuer-al ėnker ȝréne,

an iambic line with three accents.) Moreover, I prefer to take ver. 1086:

Syn þou art erthly thyself? . in an ȳll tyme,

as indicated, and not, as Rosenthal, *in an yll tyme.* Again ver. 576:

Too looke on Olympias . þe onorable Queene,

is better so taken than as *Too looke on*, &c., and therefore as an example of o .– : o, not of o . o : o, as Rosenthal gives it.

iii. Rosenthal is correct in saying that there is no instance of alliteration between the rough and smooth breathings in the *Alexander*.

Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight.

a.

a	. a	: a	95, 171, 241.	a	. o	: ho	208.
a	. a	: ha	330.	a	. ho	: au	948.
a	. a	: he	2335.	a	. hou	: ha	309.
a	. a	: o	110, 1463.	a	. hou	: he	2102.
a	. ha	: a	536, 2277.	a	. u	: ha	185.
a	. ha	: hu	1543.	ha	. a	: a	136, 491, 681, 1388.
a	. aw	: ha	836.	ha	. a	: ha	590.
a	. hay	: he	972.	ha	. a	: he	281.
a	. e	: a	85.	ha	. ay	: he	438.
a	. e	: o	356, 2416.	ha	. he	: a	323, 2331.
a	. he	: he	26, 467.	ha	. o	: e	657.
a	. he	: ho	289.	ha	. o	: he	2288.
a	. he	: hy	349, 2271.	ha	. hy	: a	2297.
a	. i	: o	300.	au	. e	: a	27.
a	. hi	: a	250.	ay	. e	: o	551.
a	. hi	: ha	2287.	ay	. ei	: e	629.
a	. o	: a	2466.	hay	. o	: he	223.

–	. a	: a	1654.	–	. a	: u	535,	1262.
a	. –	: au	2522.	–	. ha	: o	2123.	
–	. a	: o	275.	ha	. –	: y	649.	
a	. –	: u	93.	a	. (–? wo)	: i	42.	

e.

e	. a	: a	567.	e	. hu	: ha	788.	
e	. a	: (a)i	660.	he	. a	: aw	2301.	
e	. a	: hi	5.	he	. ha	: e	427.	
e	. a	: au	2467.	he	. a	: i	477.	
e	. ha	: e	1641.	he	. e	: ha	210.	
e	. ha	: how	379.	he	. e	: e	1808.	
e	. au	: a	2464.	he	. he	: ou	1184.	
e	. e	: he	723.	he	. o	: a	253.	
e	. e	: ho	140, 881.	he	. hou	: o	2481.	
e	. he	: ha	496.	he	. ha	: u	2079.	
e	. o	: he	2423.		e	: a	1474.	
e	. u	: e	184.					

i.

i . a : ha 698.

o.

o	. ha	: ha	1914.	ho	. e	: ay	2180.	
o	. ha	: ho	2016.	ho	. i	: he	1930.	
o	. au	: he	1001.	ho	. i	: o	2182.	
o	. he	: e	630.	ho	. ho	: a	1257.	
o	. o	: ho	2412.	ou	. a	: a	29.	
o	. ho	: he	593.	hou	. ho	: ow	408.	
o	. u	: e	2190.		o	: a	841.	
ho	. ha	: e	2520.		o	: e	150.	
ho	. aw	: he	1038.		o	: o	385.	

u.

. – v : a 608.

y.

y	. u	: e	113.	hy	. ha	: e	1547.	
hy	. a	: o	2232.					

Cleanness.

a.

a	. a	: a	411, 713, 1035, 1301, 1470.		a	. o	: o	237,	698.
					a	. ho	: a	643.	
					a	. ho	: ha	626.	
a	. a	: ha	42,	688.	a	. ho	: ho	1602.	
a	. a	: i	1314.		a	. ou	: a	19.	
a	. a	: o	761.		a	. y	: au	1411.	
a	. au	: a	207.		ha	. au	: he	1707.	
a	. au	: ha	1443.		ha	. i	: ha	321.	
a	. ay	: a	650.		av	. a	: a	1477.	
a	. ay	: u	1010.		au	. a	: ew	1457.	
a	. e	: ha	573.		au	. ha	: ou	941.	
a	. he	: he	678.		au	. i	: o	1081.	
a	. e	: o	601.		au	. o	: a	937,	1276.
a	. e	: ho	485.		au	. ou	: au	795.	
a	. e	: u	1001.		ay	. ho	: e	1684.	
a	. he	: hu	1211.		a	. –	: a	924.	
a	. i	: a	572.		a	. –	: i	1173.	
a	. o	: ha	141.		au	. –	: a	258.	
a	. o	: hi	745.						

e.

e	. a	: a	329.		e	. ho	: o	705.	
e	. a	: he	317.		e	. hou	: o	602.	
e	. a	: v	303.		e	. –	: a	647,	1698.
e	. au	: ha	895.		e	. –	: ha	562.	
e	. e	: a	1323.		he	. a	: o	1749.	
e	. e	: e	241, 277, 1006.		he	. ha	: u	524.	
					he	. au	: ha	506.	
e	. e	: u	747.		he	. e	: ha	1336.	
e	. e	: y	1240.		he	. he	: u	710.	
e	. e	: hi	946.		he	. i	: he	1179.	
e	. he	: ha	349.		he	. i	: hy	1294.	
e	. hi	: e	1332.		he	. ho	: au	240.	
e	. o	: e	402.		hy	. hy	: a	380,	1098.

i.

i	. ha	: he	577.		hi	. e	: a	479.	
i	. e	: au	782.		hi	. hi	: y	430.	

o.

o	. a	: he	1086.	ho	. a	: ha	335.
o	. e	: ha	448.	ho	. ha	: e	148.
o	. he	: a	1704.	ho	. au	: a	1451.
o	. hi	: au	1600.	ho	. au	: he	1222.
o	. o	: a	1044.	ho	. au	: u	11.
o	. o	: ou	923.	ho	. ho	: a	1544.
o	. hou	: hy	623.	ho	. u	: i	14.
o	. u	: o	1092.	ho	. y	: v	1695.
o	. –	: o	299.	ou	. a	: a	357.
o	. –	: ho	1799.	ou	. –	: a	345.
o	. –	: e	1144.	hou	. ou	: hy	1290.

u.

v	. he	: ha	1520.	hu	. a	: o	426.
u	. o	: a	30.	hu	. e	: ha	874.
u	. hou	: a	1284.	hu	. i	: au	1659.
u	. u	: e	892.	hu	. o	: e	1204.
u	. u	: u	267.	v	. –	: ho	927.

y.

hy	. a	: a	656.	hy	. he	: au	1664.
hy	. e	: u	451.	hy	. o	: a	604.

Patience.

a.

a	. he	: he	411.	ha	. a	: hy	29.
a	. hy	: v	11.	ha	. ay	: hou	450.
ha	. a	: ha	17, 25.	ha	. e	: hy	434.
ha	. a	: hau	15.	ha	. o	: a	34.
ha	. a	: he	21, 23, 27.	ha	. ha	: o	217.
ha	. a	: hu	19.	hay	. e	: e	438.

e.

e . he : i 205; he . a : hi 380; he . e : e 463; he . he : a 373; eu . a : e 133.

UNIVERSITY OF

o.

o	. hay	: ho	394.	o	. v	: v	213.	
o	. he	: ho	335.	o	. hy	: he	408.	
o	. o	: hy	512.	ho	. he	: e	28,	123.

u.

u – : o 40.

Remarks on the G.C.P. Group.

i. The most characteristic peculiarity of the vowel alliteration in these three poems is the frequency with which words with initial *h* take part in it. This is the case in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* 69 times out of a total of 102 verses with vowel alliteration, in *Cleanness* 50 times out of 101 verses, and in *Patience* no less than 24 times out of 27 verses. Moreover, in all but a few instances the words in question are of English origin. The only romance words I have noted in this connection are *honour* (*Sir G.* 1038), *honoured* (*Sir G.* 593, 2412, 2520), *harnays* (*Sir G.* 590, 2016), *hoge* (*Sir G.* 208), *honest* (*C.* 14), and *haunte* (*P.* 15). It is clear, also, from the form of the indefinite article, where it is prefixed, that the *h* was really sounded. In every instance we find the form *a*; thus: *a hundreth* (*Sir G.* 1543), *a hole* (*Sir G.* 2180), *a hepe* (*C.* 1211, *P.* 380), *a horse* (*C.* 1684), *a hil* (*C.* 946), even *a hoge*—query, by analogy—(*Sir G.* 208). On the other hand we have *an ox* (*Sir G.* 208), *an errand* (*Sir G.* 1808), *an usage* (*C.* 710), &c. The same difference is shown where the negative adjective is prefixed, the most interesting example being *Patience*, ver. 394:

Ne non oxe to no hay ne no horse to water.

ii. In *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, it is not un-

common for the alliterating letter to occur three times in a first half-verse, e.g. ver. 698:

Alle þe iles of Anglesay on lyft half he haldez,

and ver. 2423:

Exellently of alle þyse oþer, under heuen-ryche.

Luick (§ 84) remarks that in such cases, although the secondary accent bearing the alliterative letter is sometimes very strong, we must not suppose that three arses, that is to say three alliterations proper, are present. This is no doubt true, and with regard to the first of the above instances, similarly constructed verses with consonant alliteration, e. g.:

1778 *Alle þe* **s**peches *of* **s**pecialté *þat* **s**prang *of her mouthe.*
1786 *For alle þe* **l**ufes *upon* **l**yue, **l**ayne *not þe* **s**oþe,

make it clear that the share of the word *alle* in the alliteration of vv. 698, 2423, is only apparent; and so again for 1038ª:

Al þe **h**onour *is your* **a**wen,

and 881ª:

Alle of **e**rmyn *in* **e**rde.

The case of the second of the two verses quoted above, viz. 2423, is less easy, and there is a similar difficulty in deciding as to which words alliterate in ver. 24:

þen in any oþer þat I wot, syn þat ilk tyme.

When two pronouns occur together the usage varies even in the classic period of alliterative verse. The most regular proceeding is for the first to alliterate (cf. Rieger, p. 31), e.g. *Christ* 324ª, *þæt* **n***ænig ôðer*, or for both to do so, *Christ* 291ª, *ænig ôðer*, but the second sometimes alliterates alone: *Menologium*, 197ᵇ, *swâ nân ôðer nâ dêð*. In *Béowulf* 534ᵇ, we have *þonne ânig ôðer man*, which Sievers (*P.B.B.* x. 239) takes as a B verse, that is to say, as *þonne ânig ôðer man*, the only arrangement possible under his five-type system. But *ânig* can alliterate even before

a noun, cp. B. 510, *nê inc ênig mon*, B. 792^{b}, *ênige þinga*, B. 3128^{b}, *ênigne dâl*, therefore I should prefer, in the above half-verse, B. 534^{b}, to take *ênig* as alliterating, and similarly *any* in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, ver. 24. The alliteration in the *Destruction of Troy*, ver. 1532:

M*ynors of* **m***arbull ston &* **m***ony oþer thinges*

appears to justify this, with which verse we may contrast *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* 551 :

A*ywan &* **E***rrik &* **o***þer ful mony.*

and with this again ver. 1036 :

S*oufre sour &* **s***aundyuer, &* **o***þer* **s***uch mony.*

Also, in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* 2423, I should assign the alliteration to *alle*, inasmuch as to give it to *ôþer* would involve a double variation from Rieger's rule, and would make the middle thesis abnormally long and heavy.

We have probably an exception to the rule in *Cleanness* 705 :

E*lle*ȝ *þay mo*ȝ*t* **h***onestly ayþer* **o***þer welde.*

Here the inversion in the second half-verse (*oþer* coming before its governing verb) speaks for giving the alliteration to the second pronoun. Cp. too what was said above on this phrase—(*William of Palerne*, Remark viii) and its use in an iambic three accent line in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, ver. 841 :

Ayþer ôþer in ârmes con fêlde.

iii. The same difficulty from redundance of the alliterating letter occurs also in *Cleanness*, e.g.:

C. 42 *Oþer ani on of alle þyse he schulde be halden utter.*
„ 1749 *He*ȝ*est of alle oþer, saf onelych tweyne.*

which, for reasons above given, I have counted as examples of **a . a : ha** and **he . a : o** respectively. On the other hand, I have taken the alliteration in ver. 601 :

*Olde Abraham in erde one*ȝ *he sytte*ȝ,

as **a . e : o** since the adjective *olde* is here merely an ornamental epithet, with scarcely more force than such titles as *syr*, *king*, &c., which never (I think) alliterate. Similarly we have *good* as an epic epithet (*gode Gawayn*, cp. ἐσθλοὶ ἑταῖροι, Il. xvi. 327) with *quasi*-alliteration in vv. 109, 2491, but with *real* alliteration in 2214. Such an epithet, excluded from alliterating, we probably have in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* 1388:

He **has**ppe*ȝ his fayre* **hal**s *his* **a**rmes *wyth-inne.*

This seems to justify our disregarding the initial of *aþel* in ver. 258:

þe aþel **au**nceteres *sune*ȝ *þat* **A**dam *wat*ȝ *called,*

where to take it as alliterating would give the half-verse a final thesis of inordinate length and weight. Whether in 207ª: *Of alle þyse aþel aungelez*, we lay the stress on *alle* or on *aþel* is a matter of no consequence as far as the form of the half-verse is concerned, but I should prefer to let the former have it.

The case is different with regard to vv. 1222:

and **hol**kked *out his* **au**en *yȝen* **he**terly *bope,*
and 1707 **ha**gerly *in his* **au**ne *hwe his* **he**ued *was couered,*

where I have treated *yȝen* and *hwe* as being in the thesis, disregarding their initial letters (cp. v. 11:

þay **hon**del *þer his* **au**ne *body &* **v**sen *hit bope*).

In these instances the adjectives are emphatic and must therefore, from their position, alliterate in preference to the nouns following, whilst to consider both adjective and noun as alliterating would unduly extend the *Auftakt*, and is moreover discountenanced by the case of ver. 11.

Similarly in ver. 380:

and **he**terly *to þi* **hy**ȝe *hylles þay* **al**ed *on faste,*

the alliteration is no doubt as indicated, the context

showing that the adjective *hyȝe* is not simply otiose; so too of course ver. 927:

here vtter *on a róunde hil hit* houeȝ *hit one,*

and v. 1799 *þe* ornementes *of góddeȝ hous þat* holy *were maked,*

despite the apparent alliteration in *hil* and *hous*. And so again (with consonant alliteration), ver. 493:

Myryly *on a* fayr *morn* monyth *þe* fyrst,

where the crossed alliteration is evidence for laying the stress on *fayr*. A verse which seems at first sight to be upon the same footing is 573:

And al watȝ for þis ilk euel, þat vnhappen glette.

Above, however, we read, ver. 571:

Ful felly *for þat ilk* faute *for-*ferde *a kyth ryche.*

The adjective *ilca* could dispense with alliterating before a noun even in the classical period, e. g. *Genesis* 1083:

ou þa ilcan tid Tubal *Cain*

(cp. Rieger, p. 30), though this was not common; the alliteration in ver. 573, is therefore at our discretion, since the form of the verse is indecisive; and similarly in ver. 782ª:

in þat ilk euentyde.

In ver. 1600 on the other hand:

To open *vch a* hide *þyng of* aunteres *uncouþe,*

the metre speaks clearly for not alliterating with the distributive *vcha* (=*ilka*). Cp. too *Cleanness*, vv. 333, 334, 335, 338, 1233; *Patience* 361, 414.

Analogous to the cases above is that of vv. 874ª:

þat aȝly hurled in his eres,

and 1204ª *and harde hurles þurȝ þe oste,*

but the decision is here easier, since even in the oldest English verse the adverb could precede the verb without alliterating [Rieger, pp. 27, 28], and therefore we may

without hesitation ignore the initials of *azly* and *harde*. Still more certainly may we ignore that of *al* in *C.* 643:

Abraham, al hodles with armez vp folden,

remembering the naturally proclitic character of adverbs of degree (Rieger, p. 39). In the same way we very often meet with the adverb *ful* not alliterating (cp. *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* 788). In *C.* 345 on the other hand,

'Now Noe,' quoth oure lorde, 'art þou al redy,'

(a quaint line with unusually weak alliteration), *al* has the chief letter.

It must however be acknowledged that the most we can attain to with regard to cases like the foregoing is probability, more or less high, since the author of these poems, though a *maker* of some skill does not always conform to the strict rules of rhythm, obeyed by the poets of a better day. For instance in *Cleanness*, ver. 40ª:

With rent cokrez at the kne,
and *Patience* 531ª *þat pacience is a nobel poynt,*

there is no justification for the adjectives' not alliterating.

iv. As interesting cases of alliteration may be mentioned:

(1) One instance of the so-called *n*-alliteration, viz.

Cleanness, 1779
Withinne an oure of the nyzt an entré þay hade.

(2) The use of *asked* in

Patience 195
þenne ascryed þay hym skete, & asked (!) ful loude.
cp. *William of Palerne* 69
sche kolled it ful kindly & askes (!) is name.

(3) The contrast between the alliteration in *Cleanness*, ver. 14:

As be honest vt-wyth, & in-with alle fylþez,
and that in 20
Bope with-inne & with-outen, in wedez ful bryzt.

(4) The rare instances of *un-* alliterating in *Cleanness*. viz. *unhap*, ver. 892 (*unhap*, vv. 143, 150); *ungoderly*,

ver. 1092 (*ungoderly*, ver. 145); *unpryftly*, ver. 267, and possibly also *unclannesse*, ver. 30.

(5) Lastly, the alliteration of *vp-so-doun* in *Patience*, ver. 362.

Piers Plowman.

A-text. Prologue to Passus viii.
B-text. „ to „ vii.
C-text. Passus i. to „ x.

a.

a	. a	: a	A. iii. 247 = B. iii. 260 = C. iv. 418; A. viii. 119 = B. vii. 132; C. vii. 79.
a	. a	: e	C. iv. 462 (cp. B. iii. 304 a . ha : e); C. vi. 197.
a	. a	: o	B. vi. 224 = C. ix. 231.
a	. a	: ho	A. iii. 204 = B. iii. 210 = C. iv. 268.
a	. ha	: ha	B. iii. 284 = C. iv. 442 (cp. A. iii. 266 a . he : ha); C. iv. 237.
a	. ha	: e	B. iii. 304 (cp. C. iv. 462 a . a : e).
a	. ha	: hu	A. iii. 64 (cp. B. iii. 72 a . hi : he).
a	. au	: a	B. iii. 346 = C. iv. 499.
a	. au	: ha	A. v. 220 = B. v. 390 = C. vii. 440.
a	. e	: a	B. v. 366 = C. vii. 417 (cp. A. v. 210 a . – : a); B. v. 612 = C. viii. 250 (cp. A. vi. 93 a . e : e); C. ii. 289 (cp. B. i. 189 a . hi : a); C. vi. 177; C. ix. 283.
a	. e	: e	A. i. 63 = B. i. 65 = C. ii. 61.
a	. e	: i	B. v. 543 = C. viii. 181.
a	. e	: ho	C. i. 3 (cp. A. Pr. 3 = B. Pr. 3 ha . he : ho); C. i. 30 (cp. A. Pr. 28 = B. Pr. 28 a . he : ho).
a	. he	: ha	A. iii. 266 (cp. B. iii. 284 = C. iv. 442 a . ha : ha).
a	. he	: wha	C. ii. 46 (cp. A. i. 47 = B. i. 49 a . he : who).
a	. he	: e	B. vi. 147 = C. ix. 146 (cp. A. vii. 134 a . he : ho).
a	. he	: o	C. ii. 108.
a	. he	: ho	A. Pr. 28 = B. Pr. 28 (cp. C. i. 30 a . e : ho); A. vii. 134 (cp. B. vi. 147 = C. ix. 146 a . he : e).
a	. he	: who	A. i. 47 = B. i. 49 (cp. C. ii. 46).
a	. he	: hy	C. ii. 64 (cp. A. i. 66 e . – : ho; B. i. 68 – . e : ho).
a	. hei	: a	B. Pr. 140.
a	. hi	: a	B. i. 189 (cp. C. ii. 289 a . e : a).
a	. hi	: he	B. iii. 72 (cp. A. iii. 64 a . ha : hu).
a	. o	: wha	B. iii. 264 (cp. A. iii. 252 w. – : w; C. iv. 422 ha . o : a).

a	. ho	: ha	B. v. 603 (cp. C. viii. 242 ho . a : ho).
a	. hu	: he	A. viii. 6 (cp. B. vii. 6 ha . e : ss ; C. x. 6 hu . e : ss).
a	. huy	: e	C. iv. 303.
ha	. a	: ha	A. i. 171 = B. i. 195 = C. ii. 193.
ha	. a	: whi	A. vii. 135.
ha	. ha	: a	A. v. 221 ; B. v. 391 = C. vii. 441.
ha	. ha	: e	B. Pr. 179 (cp. C. i. 194 ho . ha : e) ; B. iii. 180 = C. iv. 227 (cp. A. iii. 174 ho . – : e) ; C. iv. 300.
ha	. ha	: u	A. iv. 106.
ha	. au	: ha	C. viii. 94.
ha	. e	: ay	C. iv. 435 (cp. A. iii. 263 ha . e : hei ; B. iii. 277 ha . e : ey).
ha	. e	: ye	B. i. 152 (cp. C. ii. 151 ha . e : ȝo).
ha	. e	: ey	B. iii. 277 (cp. A. iii. 263 ha . e : hei ; C. iv. 435 ha . e : ay).
ha	. e	: hei	A. iii. 263 (cp. above) ; B. vi. 4 (cp. C. ix. 2 ha . e : hy).
ha	. e	: ȝo	C. ii. 151 (cp. B. i. 151 ha . e : e).
ha	. e	: hy	C. ix. 2 (cp. B. vi. 4 ha . e : hei).
ha	. e	: s . s	B. vii. 6 (cp. C. x. 6 hu . e : s . s and A. viii. 6 a . hu : he).
ha	. he	: ey	C. x. 102.
ha	. o	: a	C. iv. 422 (cp. A. iii. 252 w . – : w ; B. iii. 264 a . o : wha).
ha	. ho	: a	C. iv. 302.
ha	. ho	: e	C. viii. 76 ; 267 = (cp. B. v. 624 = A. vi. 104 ha . hu : e) ; C. x. 5 (cp. B. vii. 5 ho . ho . e ; A. viii. 4 ho . ho : he).
ha	. hu	: e	A. vi. 104 (cp. C. viii. 76 ha . ho : e).
ai	. he	: a	C. vi. 59.
ay	. ho	: ha	C. vii. 255 (cp. B. v. 265 y . a : ha).
a	. –	: a	A. v. 56 (cp. B. v. 73 m . m : ?) ; A. v. 210 (cp. B. v. 366 = C. vii. 417 a . e : a).
–	. a	: au	B. v. 640 (cp. viii. 284 – . a : ou).
a	. –	: e	C. iv. 345, 397.
a	. –	: hei	B. i. 156 (cp. C. ii. 155 a . – : hy).
a	. –	: hey	B. v. 300 (cp. A. vii. 347 a . – : hy).
–	. a	: e	B. vi. 266 (cp. A. vii. 251 – . a : ȝe).
–	. a	: ȝe	A. vii. 251 (cp. above).
a	. –	: o	B. iv. 38.
a	. –	: ho	A. v. 234 = B. v. 461 = C. viii. 68 ; C. iv. 411.
a	. –	: v	C. iv. 338.
a	. –	: hy	C. ii. 155 (cp. B. i. 156 a . – : hei) ; C. vii. 347 (cp. B. v. 300 a . – : hey).
ha	. –	: a	C. vii. 264.
au	. –	: a	B. v. 153 = C. vii. 127.

–	. au	: whe	C. vii. 224 (cp. A. v. 132 au . – : who ; B. v. 218 ow . au : who).
au	. –	: ei	A. v. 90 (cp. B. v. 109 au . – : ey).
au	. –	: ey	B. v. 109 (cp. above).
au	. –	: who	A. v. 132 (cp. B. v. 218 ow . au : who ; C. vii. 224 – . au : whe).
–	. ay	: ha	C. iv. 324.

e.

e	. a	: a	C. viii. 173 (cp. A. vi. 19 y . a : o ; B. v. 535 e . a : o).
e	. a	: o	B. v. 535 (cp. above).
e	. ha	: a	B. vi. 5 = C. ix. 3.
e	. ha	: he	B. v. 466 = C. vii. 313 (cp. A. v. 239 v . ha : he).
e	. ha	: hey	C. x. 188.
e	. ha	: ho	B. vi. 108 = C. ix. 113 (cp. A. vii. 99 he . ha : he).
e	. ha	: how	B. vi. 118 (cp. C. ix. 123 e . ha : hoy ; A. vii. 109 ho . he : hey).
e	. ha	: hoy	C. ix. 123 (cp. above).
e	. ai	: he	C. ii. 127 (cp. A. i. 114 ei . eo : he ; B. i. 123 ey . e : he).
e	. ai	: o	C. vii. 188.
e	. e	: a	B. ii. 83 (cp. A. ii. 63 e . e : e ; C. iii. e . e : y). B. iii. 212 = C. iv. 270 (cp. A. iii. 206 e . eo : a).
e	. e	: e	A. ii. 63 (see above).
e	. e	: he	A. vii. 126.
e	. e	: i	A. i. 120 = B. i. 129.
e	. e	: o	C. x. 214.
e	. e	: y	C. iii. 88 (cp. A. ii. 63 e . e : e ; B. ii. 83 e . e : a).
e	. e	: hy	C. x. 203.
e	. he	: a	A. v. 59 = B. v. 76 = C. vii. 63.
e	. he	: e	C. ii. 133.
e	. he	: ho	A. Pr. 50 = C. i. 51 (cp. B. Pr. 53 he . he : ho) ; A. v. 235 = B. v. 462 (cp. C. viii. 69 hu . e : ho).
e	. eo	: a	A. iii. 206 (cp. B. iii. 212, C. iv. 270 e . e : a).
e	. i	: who	B. v. 40.
e	. hi	: he	A. vi. 99 (cp. B. v. 619 = C. viii. 262 e . hy : he).
e	. o	: a	B. ii. 173.
e	. o	: he	C. i. 123.
e	. o	: o	B. iii. 237.
e	. ho	: he	C. iv. 243.
e	. ho	: hu	A. vii. 248 = B. vi. 263 = C. ix. 273.
e	. u	: ha	C. vii. 307.
e	. v	: v	C. vii. 87 (cp. B. v. 121 e . y : y).
e	. hu	: a	C. i. 14 (A. Pr. 13 heo . e : hei ; B. Pr. 13 he . e : hie).

e	. hu	: he	C. ix. 263.
e	. y	: y	B. v. 121 (cp. C. vii. 87 e . v : v).
e	. hy	: he	B. v. 619=C. viii. 262 (cp. A. vi. 99 e . hi : he).
he	. a	: a	A. vii. 198 (cp. B. vi. 212 he . a : ay=C. ix. 219).
he	. a	: ay	B. vi. 212=C. ix. 219.
he	. ha	: e	B. ii. 228=C. iii. 238 (cp. A. ii. 204 heo . ha : e).
he	. e	: a	C. iv. 235.
he	. e	: e	C. iv. 94; C. ix. 66 (cp. A. vii. 60 he . he : e; B. vi. 67 he . e : he).
he	. e	: he	B. vi. 67 (cp. above); C. ii. 17 (cp. A. i. 17 hi . eo : v; B. i. 17 hy . e : he); C. ix. 183 (cp. A. vii. 177 he . he : he=B. vi. 190).
he	. e	: ey	C. vi. 153.
he	. e	: hie	B. Pr. 13 (cp. A. Pr. 13 heo . e : hei; C. i. 14 e . hu : a).
he	. e	: ho	A. v. 249.
he	. he	: e	B. iii. 129=C. iv. 166 (cp. A. iii. 125 he . he : eo); A. vii. 60 (cp. B. vi. 67 he . e : he; C. ix. 66 he . e : e).
he	. he	: eo	A. iii. 125 (cp. above).
he	. i	: ha	B. iii. 241.
he	. ho	: e	C. iv. 252.
ei	. eo	: he	A. i. 114 (B. i. 123 ey . e : he; C. ii. 127 e . ai : he).
hei	. hu	: e	A. vii. 300 (cp. B. vi. 314 hei . huy : e; C. ix. 336 hey . hy : e).
heo	. ha	: e	A. ii. 204 (cp. B. ii. 228=C. iii. 238 he . ha : e).
heo	. e	: hei	A. Pr. 13 (cp. B. Pr. 13 he . e : hie; C. i. 14 e . hu : a).
ey	. e	: he	B. i. 123 (cp. A. i. 114 ei . eo : he; C. ii. 127 e . ai : he).
ey	. hie	: a	B. Pr. 128.
hey	. hy	: e	C. ix. 336 (cp. A. vii. 300 hei . hu : e B. vi. 314 hei . huy : e).
e	. –	: hai	B. vii. 160=C. x. 309 (cp. A. viii. 146, 147).
e	. –	: ho	A. i. 66 (cp. B. i. 68 – . e : ho; C. ii. 64 a . he : hy).
–	. e	: ho	B. i. 68 (cp. above).
e	. –	: hy	C. x. 315.
–	. e	: ei	C. i. 55 (cp. A. Pr. 54=B. Pr. 57 – . he : e).
–	. he	: e	A. Pr. 54=B. Pr. 57 (cp. above).
hey	. –	: a	A. v. 91 (cp. B. v. 110 ho . e : ha).

i.

i	. a	: a	A. iii. 249.
i	. a	: au	B. v. 640 (cp. C. viii. 284 i . a : ou).
i	. a	: ou	C. viii. 284 (cp. above).
hi	. hei	: e	A. viii. 4 (cp. B. vii. 4 hy . hei : e; C. x. 4 hy . hey : e).
hi	. eo	: v	A. i. 17 (cp. B. i. 17 hy . e : he; C. ii. 17 he . e : he)

hi	. o	: he	A. v. 183 (cp. B. v. 339 hi . ho : ha ; C. vii. 389 hi . ha : ha).
hi	. o	: ho	A. v. 172 (cp. B. v. 329=C. vii. 378 hi . ha : ho) ; A. v. 185 (B. v. 341 hi . ho : ho ; C. vii. 391 ha . ho : ho).
hi	. o	: v	B. v. 164 (cp. C. vii. 149 – . ho : of).
i	. –	: i	C. iv. 373.

O.

o	. a	: hu	A. vi. 109=B. v. 629=C. viii. 272.
o	. e	: ha	B. v. 409=C. viii. 18.
o	. e	: wha	A. ii. 96.
o	. e	: e	B. ii. 14.
o	. e	: he	B. Pr. 164.
o	. he	: he	B. Pr. 106 ; B. v. 233=C. vii. 235 ; C. iv. 340.
o	. o	: e	C. x. 211.
o	. ho	: ha	A. vii. 76=B. vi. 85=C. ix. 92 ; C. vii. 193.
o	. ho	: he	A. viii. 83=B. vii. 99=C. x. 175 ; C. vii. 19.
o	. hou	: ho	C. iii. 228 (cp. A. ii. 194 o . hu : ho ; B. ii. 218 o . how : ho).
o	. how	: ho	B. ii. 218 (cp. above).
o	. hu	: ho	A. ii. 194 (cp. above).
o	. hy	: hi	B. vi. 133 (A. vii. 124 ho . hy : ou).
ho	. a	: ho	C. viii. 242 (cp. B. v. 603 a . ho : ha).
ho	. ha	: a	A. vii. 283=B. vi. 298=C. ix. 320.
ho	. ha	: e	C. i. 194 (cp. B. Pr. 179 ha . ha : e).
ho	. ha	: v	A. vii. 175 (cp. B. vi. 188 hu . ha : he ; C. ix. 181 ho . ha : he).
ho	. e	: ha	B. v. 110 (cp. A. v. 91 hey . – : a) ; C. vii. 306 ; x. 190.
ho	. e	: hy	C. x. 201.
ho	. he	: e	A. v. 168=B. v. 325=C. vii. 374.
ho	. ho	: a	C. x. 219 ; B. v. 227 (cp. below).
ho	. ho	: e	A. v. 141=C. vii. 233 (cp. B. v. 227 ho . ho : a ; B. vii. 5 (cp. C. x. 5 ha . ho : e ; A. viii. 5 ho . ho : he).
ho	. ou	: ho	A. vii. 190 (cp. B. vi. 203 ho . ow : ho ; C. ix. 207 ho . ow : ha).
ho	. ow	: ha	C. ix. 207 (cp. above).
ho	. ow	: ho	B. vi. 203 (cp. above).
ho	. hu	: e	A. vii. 218=B. vi. 233=C. ix 238.
ho	. hy	: ou	A. vii. 124 (cp. B. vi. 133 o . hy : hi).
ow	. au	: who	B. v. 218 (cp. A. v. 132 au . – : who ; C. vii. 224 – . au : whe).
o	. –	: a	C. x. 235.
o	. –	: hy	C. viii. 249 (cp. A. vi. 92=B. v. 611 w . w : w).

ho	. –	: e	A. iii. 174 (cp. B. iii. 180=C. iv. 227 ha . ha : e).
–	. ho	: o	C. vii. 149 (cp. B. v. 164 hi . o : v).
ho	. –	: o	C. ii. 72 (cp. A. i. 73=B. i. 75 ho . – ou).
ho	. –	: ou	A. i. 73=B. i. 75 (cp. above).

u.

u	. a	: a	B. ii. 86 (cp. A. ii. 66 y . v : a; C. iii. 91 v . a : o).
u	. a	: o	A. viii. 40; C. iii. 91 (cp. above).
v	. ha	: he	A. v. 239 (cp. B. v. 466=C. vii. 313 e . ha : he).
u	. u	: a	B. v. 240=C. vii. 239.
v	. v	: ho	A. viii. 98=C. x. 290 (cp. B. vii. 114 y . y : ho).
hu	. a	: ha	A. vi. 11=B. v. 527 (cp. C. viii. 165 ho . ha : ha).
hu	. ha	: a	B. vi. 298=C. ix. 320 (cp. A. vii. 283 ho . ha : a).
hu	. e	: ho	C. viii. 69 (cp. A. v. 235 e . he : ho=B. v. 462).
hu	. he	: e	C. iv. 310.

y.

y	. a	: ha	B. v. 265 (cp. C. vii. 255 ay . ho : ha).
y	. a	: o	A. vi. 19 (cp. B. v. 536 e . a : o; C. viii. 173 e . a : a); B. v. 410=C. viii. 19.
y	. e	: o	C. x. 152.
y	. v	: a	A. ii. 66 (cp. B. ii. 86 u . a : a; C. iii. 91 v . a : o).
y	. y	: ho	B. vii. 114 (cp. A. viii. 98=C. x. 290 v . v : ho).
hy	. e	: he	B. i. 17 (A. i. 17 hi . eo : v; C. ii. 17 he . e : he).
hy	. hei	: e	B. vii. 4 (cp. A. viii. 4 hi . hei : e; C. x. 4 hy . hey : e).
hy	. hey	: e	C. x. 4 (cp. above).
y	. –	: e	C. vii. 20.
y	. –	: i	A. i. 48=B. i. 50.

Remarks.

i. In the foregoing table the sign = indicates that the alliteration is the same for the references so connected. Variations are enclosed in brackets. Where a reference stands by itself, the verse referred to has no counterpart in the other texts.

ii. The alliteration is identical for all three texts in fourteen instances. The A. text contains eight verses with

vowel alliteration not found in the other two texts, the B. text ten, and the C. text forty-four. Vowel alliteration occurs in the A. text in about 3·6 per cent. of the whole number of verses in the *Vision,* in the B. text in about 3·8 per cent., and in the C. text in 3·9 per cent. Thus Langland became somewhat more free in his use of this kind of alliteration as he grew older. Rosenthal calls attention to the care which he bestowed in his later versions to remedy verses defective in his earlier ones. We may see this from the following examples:

A. v. 210 *And after* **a**l *this surfet . an* **a**ccesse *he hedde*
B. v. 366 *And after* **a**l *this* **e**xcesse *. he had an* **a**ccidie

(cp. C. vii. 417). Here clearly, *excesse* in B. v. 366 replaces *surfet* in A. v. 210 in order to produce an alliteration with *al.* For accenting the word on the first syllable we have the evidence of *accesse* in the verse from A., which word also shows that we must give the alliteration in 366^{b} to *accidie.*

Compare again:

A. vi. 93 *Tho that* **A**dam &ᵒ **E**ue *.* **e**eten *heore bone.*
B. v. 612 *Tho* **A**dam &ᵒ **E**ue *.* **e**ten **a**pples *unrosted.*
C. viii. 250 *That* **A**dam &ᵒ **E**ue *.* **a**ȝens *ous* **a**lle *shutte,*

in which an amusing conflict goes on between sound and sense, which are at length satisfactorily harmonized in the third example (cp. below, A. iii. 174, &c.).

Further:

B. v. 543 **A**xen *after hym* **e**r *. til now* **i**n *this place*;
C. viii. 181 **A**sken *after hym* **e**r *now . in thys* **i**lke *place,*
also B. ii. 83 *And the* **e**rldome *of* **e**nuye *. and wratthe togideres.*
C. iii. 88 *The* **e**rldom *of* **e**nuye *. and* **y**re *he hym graunteth.*
and A. i. 17 *And for he* **h**ihte *the* **e**orthe *. to seruen ow* **v**chone.
B. i. 17 *And therfore he hy*ȝ*te the* **e**rthe *. to* **h**elp ȝow *vchone.*
and A. iii. 174 *Thow hast* **h**onged *on my nekke .* **e**nleue *tymes.*
B. iii. 180 *Thow hast* **h**anged *on myne* **h**alf *.* **e**lleuene *tymes*
C. iv. 227 *Thow hast* **h**anged *on myn* **h**als *.* **e**lleuen *tymes*
and A. v. 91 *Hou* **H**eyne *hath a newe cote .* **a**nd *his wyf another.*
B. v. 110 *And bi***h**olde *haw* **E**leyne *.* **h**ath *a newe cote.*

all cases in which deficient or defective alliteration in the earlier version has been remedied in the later. Cp. also: A. vii. 60, B. vi. 67, C. ix. 66; B. i. 89 and C. ii. 189; B. i. 68 and C. ii. 64; B. v. 164 and C. vii. 149; B. iii. 264 and C. iv. 422. A needless repetition has been avoided and at the same time the form of the verse greatly improved in C. i. 193[a]:

Ne haue it h*ongid aboute hus* h*als,*
for B. Pr. 179 *Ne* h*angen it aboute the cattes* h*als,*

where *cattes* is quite out of place in the thesis. However it is doubtful if this consideration weighed with William for a little earlier (B. Pr. 170; C. i. 185) we have this word in the same anomalous position in both texts.

Some of the verses in A. and B. afterwards dropped altogether were probably left out as past mending, particularly B. iv. 38 (a hopeless verse), perhaps also A. v. 56; vii. 126; iii. 249. On the other hand A. viii. 40 which has been omitted from B. and C. is metrically faultless and is an unusually good specimen of vowel alliteration, viz. u . a : o:

V*sure and* a*uarice · and othes* I *defende.*

In some cases the alliteration has certainly been changed for the worse, e. g. in C. viii. 173:

In E*rmanie, in* A*lisaundre · and in* D*amascle.*
Cp. B. v. 535 *In* E*rmonye, in* A*lisaundre · in many other places,*

although the latter verse is perhaps not faultless, seeing that the natural stress in reading would fall on *many* as in the already quoted *Destruction of Troy* 1532:

M*ynors of* m*arbull ston &* m*ony oþer thinges*

(cf. Luick, p. 397). So again A. vii. 175[b] v*p for to loke* has been, with doubtful taste changed in B. vi. 188[b] into *on* h*em for to loke.*

iii. Langland is the least scrupulous of the fourteenth century poets in admitting words of slight sentence stress to alliterative rank. An example of this is his frequent

use of *have* (and its forms) in alliteration, and that not only as a principal but also as an auxiliary verb. As a principal verb *have* occasionally alliterates in the classical period, thus, h*abban* twice in *Béowulf* 446ᵇ, 462ᵇ, and once in the *Elene* 621ᵇ, and *hafa* (imperative) *Béowulf* 659ᵃ. It is however usually unaccented (cf. Hinze, *Zum Andreas*, p. 5), and as an auxiliary never alliterates in the best period, as far as I know. In the *Vision* the word alliterates as an *infinitive* in A. vii. 135ᵃ, C. vii. 255ᵇ, B. v. 466ᵃ, &c., as an *imperative* in C. vii. 307ᵇ, and as an *auxiliary* in A. v. 220ᵇ, B. v. 391ᵃ and B. i. 152ᵃ. Occasionally it receives additional weight by an inversion. Thus in C. x. 187:

And alle h*oly* h*ermites* · h*aue schal the same,*

and B. v. 391

And ȝ*it* h*aue I* h*ated hir* · a*l my lyf-tyme.*

The latter verse has been changed from

And ȝ*it ich*a*ue i-*h*ated hire,* &c. (A. text v. 221ᵃ)

Such a change is I think contrary to Langland's usual practice, which was rather to substitute direct for earlier inverted constructions. This he does in C. viii. 242ᵃ:

	The h*okes aren* A*lmys-dedes,*
for	*Of* A*lmes-dedes ar the* h*okes*, B. v. 603;
also in C. ix. 320ᵃ	H*unger eet al in haste,*
for B. vi. 298ᵇ	*Al* H*unger eet in* h*ast*;
and in C. viii. 69ᵃ	*Til ich haue* h*urd* e*uesong,*
for B. v. 462	*Til ich haue* e*uensonge* h*erde.*

Another word of weak force which sometimes alliterates, but more often not, is the indefinite *all*. In A. iii. 247ᵇ *and al his peple aftur* (cf. B. iii. 260) we might doubt whether *al* or *aftur* has the chief letter, were it not for the variation in C. iv. 418ᵇ *and* a*l hus lyge puple*, which verse is again a guide for the alliteration in B. v. 227 a*l hire lyftyme*. Where the expression *alle that* occurs, the word *alle* for the most part does not alliterate, cp. B. i. 118, B. vii. 6, C. ix. 66, &c. We have however C. vi. 59ᵇ a*lle that ben crounede* and A. viii. 6ᵃ *and* a*ll that euere hulpen him*, the word *euere* in the second example being of secondary

force to *al*, the sense of which it generalizes, as of *who* in our modern *whoever*. With regard to the alliteration of such slight words as *in* (A. i. 128[b]), *and* (A. iii. 249[b]) I have nothing to add to what has been already said (cp. *William of Palerne*, Remark iii).

iv. The expression *either other* comes before us again in C. iv. 340, C. vii. 149, B. v. 164. The last two cases are similar to *William of Palerne*, ver. 1010 (cp. Remarks ix). C. iv. 340 is doubtless to be scanned thus:

And ayther ys o*peres* help . *of* hem *cometh retribution,*

for (1) it is clear that *help* is in one of the arses of the first half-verse and therefore (2) that *operes* must be in the other, inasmuch as preceding *help*, which governs it in the genitive, it has naturally a still stronger stress. Thus in no case of this combination that we have examined does the word *either* alliterate.

v. I have noticed but one case of *n*-alliteration common to all three texts, viz. that in

A. iii. 265 *In auenture hit* n*uyȝed me . an ende wol I make.*
B. iii. 279 *An auenture it* n*oyed men . none ende wil I make.*
and C. iv. 437 *An aunter hit* n*uyede me . non ende wol ich make.*

The A. text contains another example, viz. vi. 119:

'N*o,' quath an apeward . 'for* n*out that I knowe!'*

which has been altered in B. v. 640 to

'*Ne* I,' *quod an apewarde . 'bi* au*ȝte that I knowe!'*

and similarly in C. viii. 284. Beyond these instances I have observed no other in any of the texts. Ordinary alliteration with *n* is also rare in the *Vision*, occurring in the A. text about fifteen times in 1833 vv., viz. ii. 97, 115, 144; iii. 182; v. 181; vi. 61, 64; vii. 14, 136, 138, 228 231, 293; viii. 139; ix. 106. (For the alliteration of the pronoun 'I' in B. v. 640, C. viii. 284 see *Morte Arthure*, Remark vii.)

vi. Vowel alliteration is mixed with *h*-alliteration to a still greater degree in the *Vision* than in the *G. C. P.*

group (=*Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, &c.). In the latter poems we find this combination in about 62·2 per cent. of the verses alliterating with the vowel, in the *Vision* we have it in as many as 74·3 per cent.

Unlike the *G. C. P.* group, however, the *Vision* makes no distinction between words commencing with a vowel, and words with initial *h* (see *G. C. P.* Remark i). In the *G. C. P.* group the indefinite article *a* is prefixed even to a romance word beginning with *h* (*a hoge G.* 208); in the *Vision* we invariably find the form *an* even before English words with initial *h*. Thus, just as, before initial vowels, we have:

an archangel, an auenture, an aunte, an accesse, non ale, non ende (in A. and B., but in C.—viii. 68, ii. 129—*no ale, no ende*). So we have before *h*:—

an hermite A. Pr. 3 (cp. B. Pr. 3); *an hep* A. Pr. 50 (cp. B. Pr. 53 C. i. 51); and again A. v. 168 (cp. B. v. 325, C. vii. 374), also A. v. 178 (cp. C. vii. 385); *an hundred* A. Pr. 84, A. vi. 11, A. vi. 104 (cp. B. Pr. 210, v. 527, 624; C. i. 159, viii. 165, 267); *an heui bridel* A. iv. 20; *an hote heruest* C. vi. 7; *an horne* C. iv. 16; *an heire* C. vii. 6 (cp. A. v. 48. B. v. 66); *an half aker* A. vii. 4 (cp. B. vi. 4, C. ix. 2), and similarly, *none hors* A. ii. 144, *non halfpeny ale* A. vii. 293 (cp. B. vi. 307, C. ix. 329).

Concluding Remarks.

Vowel alliteration in the fourteenth century was evidently in a moribund condition: for how long past it has been practically dead would require a further investigation. In one poem only—the *Morte Arthure*—does it show anything like the vigour and variety with which it appears in *Béowulf*. In *Piers Plowman*, except when associated with *h*, its presence is almost imperceptible; in the *Destruction of Troy*, *William of Palerne*, and especially in the *Alexander*, it has become for the most part a monotonous repetition of the same vowel. In *Béowulf*, on the other

hand, there is only one example, viz., ver. 836 (ea . ea : ea) of identically the same vowel in all three arses of the verse.

Such a difference points to a difference of feeling with regard to vowel alliteration. It is clear that, whilst the *Béowulf* poet sought variety, the poets of the fourteenth century sought identity of vowel. The explanation seems to be this. That which alliterated for the *Béowulf* poem was, as Rieger says (p. 16), the *spiritus lenis*, or, better, the *glottal catch*. In the fourteenth century this was, in the South of England at least, no longer or but faintly heard, and therefore the poets, feeling that alliteration is *entweder genau* or *gar nichts* (Rieger, 16), strove to alliterate as far as possible with the same vowel. To do so altogether would, of course, have been intolerably irksome.

I hazard the conjecture that the reason why vowel alliteration still has much of its old character in the *Morte Arthure* is, that the *glottal catch* was retained longer in Scotland, where this poem is generally allowed to have been written, than in England. Whether any trace of it is still to be heard in the language of the people I cannot say, but it is significant that its companion sound —the *h* or *spiritus asper*—is much better preserved north of the Tweed than south. This does not seem to be the effect merely of the better education which has prevailed among the lower classes in Scotland. Indeed in one case an *h* has been retained which was given up by orthography centuries ago, viz., in the expression '*That's it*' still, I am told, pronounced '*That's hit*' by many people. The retention of the guttural in *loch*, and other words is a similar phenomenon.

In the *Morte Arthure* the so-called alliteration between *spiritus lenis* and *spiritus asper* is very rare though not—as Trautmann asserted—wholly unknown. In the *G.C.P.* group it is remarkably common, and that the *h* was not mute in such cases, the form of the indefinite article used before it shows. In *Piers Plowman*, where this alliterative

combination is still more common, but where the indefinite article has the same form before *h* as before a vowel, I strongly suspect the *h* was pretty much a dead letter.

In one respect vowel alliteration may be said to begin with the fourteenth century, for the *glottal catch* is, like the *h*, a throat consonant, differing from it in possessing no symbol. It is not then the vowels themselves which alliterate in *Béowulf*, but this unwritten consonant which precedes them. On the other hand, in the a . a : a combination so common in the fourteenth century, it is really the vowels which alliterate, according to the view expressed above.

We have already mentioned that where vowels alliterate (or appear to do so) in *Béowulf*, it is usually different ones which are used.

Similar variety in the vowels of alliterating syllables is seen when these commence with a consonant. I noted above (Chap. II. p. 56) a passage in *Béowulf* (320–324) where vowel assonances were strongly marked. The vowels following the alliterating letters are, however, varied, e. g. :

strêet—stân—stig ; *gum.—gäd.—gûð* ; *heard—hond—hring* ;
song.—sear.—sele ; *gryre—geat.—gangan.*

We have only to glance down a page of *Béowulf* to see that assonance between alliterating syllables is not sought for. To show this clearly the vowels in the alliterating syllables of the first fifty verses of *Béowulf*, with consonant alliteration, are here added :—

V. 1. â . – : eâ	V. 17. u . ea : o	V. 30. o . eó : i
„ 2. eó . – : y	„ 18. eó . ê : æ̂	„ 31. eó . a : a
„ 3. y . ê : ea	„ 19. y . – : e	„ 32. ŷ . – : i
„ 5. o . æ : eo	„ 21. o . eo : æ	„ 34. ê . – : eó
„ 7. eá . u : ô	„ 23. i . – : î	„ 35. eá . y : ea
„ 8. eó . o : eo	„ 24. eó . æ̂ : o	„ 36. æ̂ . æ : â
„ 10. o . – : ŷ	„ 25. æ . æ̂ : a	„ 37. eo . – : æ
„ 11. o . y : ô	„ 26. y . – : æ	„ 38. y . – : eó
„ 13. eo . ea : o	„ 27. e . ê : eá	„ 39. i . – : ea
„ 14. o . ô : y	„ 28. – . æ̂ : i	„ 40. i . y : ea
„ 16. a . – : î	„ 29. æ̂ . î : e	„ 41. â . æ : i

V. 42. ô . – : eo	V. 49. eâ . â : eô	V. 55. o . æ̂ : æ
„ 43. – . æ̂ : â	„ 50. u . ô : e	„ 57. eá . ea : eó
„ 44. eó . – : â	„ 51. e . ô : e	„ 58. a . û : æ
„ 45. u . – : o	„ 52. æ . eo : æ	„ 59. eó . – : o
„ 47. – . e : e	„ 53. – . u : eó	„ 60. o . ô : eo
„ 48. eá . eá : o	„ 54. eó . eó : o	

The variety here is not far short of what has been seen in the case of syllables with initial vowels.

I conclude, therefore, (1) that Vietor is right in taking vowel alliteration (so-called) as an evidence that in the oldest English the *glottal catch* was heard before initial vowels, and (2) that the altered character of the vowel alliteration in the Early English poems which we have examined is a reason for supposing that this sound was already fast disappearing in the fourteenth century, and in the south of England, at all events, was already extinct.

The very small place which vowel alliteration holds in *Layamon* suggests, in the same way, that in Gloucestershire the *glottal catch* had been discontinued early in the thirteenth century. In the first 4000 lines of the poem (which are all that I have examined), such scanty instances of vowel alliteration as occur are mostly confined to the letter *a*. K. Regel's article '*Die Alliteration in Lajamon*' (*Germanistische Studien*, i. 171), amidst all the wealth of alliterative phraseology which it exhibits, as inherited by *Layamon* from the older poets, gives only the following examples of alliteration upon vowels:

PARALLELISMS.

v. 5202 (Calig. MS.)	*mid* o*rde and mid* e*gge.*	
„ 15770 „ „	o*rd fram þan* e*nde.*	(cp. 22983.)

OLD FORMULÆ.

„ 16234 „ „	*þer wes þe* a*ðele* eo*rl.*	
„ 5 „ „	A*ldolf ihaten.*	(cp. 16559.)
„ 19104 „ „	*and þe* eo*rl* A*ldolf scal beon ure* a*ldre.*	
„ 20045 „ „	*to gaines* A*rðure* a*ðelest kingen.*	

V. 29476 (Calig. MS.) *þa seiden men* **A***nglisce*
a*ðele iborne.*
„ 29481 „ „ *Iwis ge beod* **Æ***nglisce*
E*nglen ilicchest.*

The *Ormulum* is not an alliterative poem, but, nevertheless, contains a good deal of alliteration, and (in keeping with its more northern origin) has more variety of vowel alliteration than *Layamon*. The best examples among the first 10,000 verses are the following:

6775 *Wiþþ***u***tenn* **o***rd and* **e***nde.* Cp. 9676.
3577 *and* **á** *beoþ* **b***utenn* **e***nde.* (Cp. *Satan* 315; also *Orm.* 409, 4208, 4827, 8879.)
7570 *Att* **u***re lifess* **e***nde.* Cp. 10256; also 2512.
4803 *þurrh* **a***n full* **a***tell* **a***dle.*
5055 *And* **a***n full* **a***þell kinde.*
5146 *Forr lufe off* **a***nig* **o***þerr mann.* Cp. *Béowulf* 503, 534.
8174 *þatt* **a***nig mann nagg* **a***ghenn.*
4187 *Off* **e***hhte daghess* **e***lde.* Cp. 4229, 8396.

These appear to be undoubted specimens: others which I have noted are more doubtful. Indeed, it is only by comparison of several verses that we can in some cases be sure that alliteration was intended. Thus, in *Ormulum* 3385

þurrh Godess **e***nngless* **aw***wnedd*

there is apparent alliteration between the last two words, and comparison with 3395, 3429, 3507, 4004, 9608, confirms it. Again the alliteration in 3699

Wiþþ **e***nngless* **e***che fode*

is attested by vv. 3867, 4369, and so on.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE END.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 1 1993

Berkeley

YC 18020